

TPAEC

An Opportunity *to* Teach

Meeting
Title II Teacher
Education
Reporting
Requirements

A Manual
for Institutions
and States

© 2000

American Association of State

Colleges and Universities

1307 New York Avenue, N.W. • Fifth Floor

Washington, DC 20005-4701

202.293.7070 • 202.296.5819 • www.aascu.org

An Opportunity to Teach

**Meeting Title II Teacher Education Reporting Requirements
A Manual for Institutions and States**

**Prepared by the Teacher Preparation
Accountability and Evaluation Commission**



CONTENTS

Letter from the Chairperson.....	5
Introduction	7
Thoughts to Ponder	8
Analytical Contents for Institutional Reports	15
Analytical Contents for State Reports	70
Appendix (Federal Law).....	89



LETTER FROM THE CHAIRPERSON

In October of 1998 the Higher Education Reauthorization Act mandated that all Title IV funded colleges with teacher preparation programs and states that approve such programs develop and publish an annual report on their teacher preparation programs. Like many legislative mandates it was easier said than done. Faced with a common problem, five national higher education associations and six state systems of higher education chose to cooperate with the mandate by providing technical assistance and advice on how to comply with the new requirement. The result was the creation of the Teacher Preparation Accountability and Evaluation Commission (TPAEC). Over 70 members of the higher education community actively participated in the work of the commission and another 200 actively monitored its work.

TPAEC did not play an advocacy role in the development of the *Reference and Reporting Guide* that was developed by the U.S. Department of Education to implement this legislation but TPAEC did actively cooperate with the government relations professionals at TPAEC's sponsoring associations. In retrospect it is clear that the substantive work done by TPAEC was influential in changing the way the Department of Education approached the report requirement. The how-to approach adopted by the department in their April 2000 Reference and Reporting Guide followed the example of early work done by TPAEC and represented a major change in their approach to regulating the development of the reports.

Early on, TPAEC adopted the policy of making sure that our recommendations would help states and institutions answer the questions that are asked by the legislation. You will find carefully thought through explanations and examples that will help you do just that. In addition, we have gone one step further. We have developed recommendations about additional supplemental information we think you should add to the required publication of your teacher preparation report. Our aim is to help clarify for the public how our programs respond to public need and how different institutions and states approach that objective. We think that if you merely publish the federal form and the answers for your state or institution that the public will be misled rather than informed and we urge all report publishers to carefully think through what additional information should be published. We have included many categories for



AN OPPORTUNITY TO TEACH

you to consider and many suggestions on how to present the information. We think our recommendations in this area will be of particular help to you as you work to comply with this new information mandate. Treat this mandate as an opportunity to teach our publics about us.

We wish you well in this new task, we stand ready to answer questions and we hope our work will help develop public confidence in our teacher preparation programs.

Molly C. Broad

President, University of North Carolina
Chair, TPAEC Policy Council



INTRODUCTION

October of 1998 saw passage of the latest revisions to the federal Higher Education Act. Among the usual host of statutory modifications was a new reporting requirement for teacher preparation programs that are housed in institutions that receive Title IV funds and for states that approve those teacher preparation programs. This legislation called for the development of critical definitions and a uniform reporting process by the U.S. Department of Education. Washington based higher education associations had two areas of concern about this legislation. First, they wanted to influence the development of the rules by which the reports would be detailed and second, they wanted to help their member institutions comply with the reporting requirements. The Teacher Preparation Accountability and Evaluation Commission (TPAEC) was created to address the second set of concerns. The first set of concerns was assigned to the government relations offices of the sponsoring associations.

The schedule for reporting on teacher preparation programs that is now in effect is as follows:

- **October 7, 2000** States must report to the U.S. Department of Education on the status of its definitions and on its process for gathering institutional reports
- **April 7, 2001** Each teacher preparation program's institution must file its first annual report with the state
- **October 7, 2001** States must file their first annual report with the U.S. Department of Education
- **April 7, 2002** The U.S. Secretary of Education must file a report with Congress on the States' efforts to improve teacher quality (and institutions must file their second annual report with their state)

The exact form of the institution reports is not yet determined because states have been charged by the U.S. Department of Education to develop the data collection and calculation processes for those reports. States must also develop several high stakes definitions for use in the reports. Among



the most important of these definitions are: *'low performing institution,'* and *'alternative route program.'* Institutions must be consulted by the state on all these matters as well as the development of dispute resolution and appeal processes in the state. These are the matters about which the state must report to the Secretary of Education on October 7, 2000. That date is effectively the time by which the state and institutional consultations must be complete.

This manual is meant to be used in conjunction with the U.S. Department of Education's *Reference and Reporting Guide for Preparing State and Institutional Reports on the Quality of Teacher Preparation* (NCES 2000-089). That report can be purchased from the U.S. Government Printing Office or can be downloaded from the World Wide Web at www.ed.gov/offices/OPE/News/teacherprep/reportingguide.pdf. Page numbers in this manual refer to pages in the *Reference and Reporting Guide* and correspond to the portable document format (.pdf) version of that publication from the web and not the Microsoft Word version of the document.

TPAEC's companion technical assistance manual can be purchased from the AASCU publications office 202.293.7070 or can be downloaded from the World Wide Web at www.aascu.org/tpaec/tech-manual.pdf.

THOUGHTS TO PONDER

To States and Institutions

The reports should not be prepared with a defensive message. Remember that your public report should not be just the duplicated annual questionnaire that must be filed with the state and the Secretary of Education. Rather it should explain the whole range of teacher preparation programs offered, who is served, and the measures taken to ensure that quality teacher preparation is delivered. Teacher preparation is important and complex. Be candid about the complexity and difficulty of quality teacher preparation. Convey both themes in your public report. Be willing to acknowledge differences of opinion in the field about the best measures of quality.



States have not adopted the same philosophies of education and independent colleges and public colleges respond to different missions. Quality in teacher preparation is significantly affected by the state laws and regulations that govern teacher preparation programs and teacher licensure. Explain the impact of that philosophy and how your institution delivers on that philosophy.

Parents, students, legislators, governors, and the public at large will have access to your public report. Each is likely to read the report differently. Prepare your report to anticipate their different concerns and point of view. Finally, anticipate comparisons by the media and policy makers and try to minimize their effect. Fairly or unfairly, you can be assured that the media will rank your institutions from top to bottom in your state even though the official rankings are by quartile. If you have a reason to be compared to other peers, you must provide the media with that information when you publish your annual report. National media will undoubtedly rank and compare states even though the *Reference and Reporting Guide* declares that inappropriate. Build your response to such reporting in your published report.

To States

Please respect the individuality of higher education institutions and don't use the reports to try to homogenize teacher preparation programs in your state. One of the strengths of American higher education is that it is a market system of institutions that serves different populations for different purposes. This heterogeneity ensures that experimentation persists and that a wide segment of the population is served.

To Institutions

Take advantage of the opportunity to contextualize the data on your institution. Make clear your perspective in teacher education, your mission, and the population you serve. Evidence of effectiveness beyond test scores should be included in the contextual section. Verify data and calculations for your institution. Even given the best of intentions on the part of the state or the testing company, the calculation of pass rates is a very detailed and complex process. These factors make it likely that



mistakes will occur—especially in the first critical years of reporting. If you don't check the accuracy of what is included and calculated for your institution, you won't know if your institution is treated properly. In short, don't rely on others (the state or testing agencies) to have done the calculations correctly. Institutions will have to live with the public relations consequences of any mistakes. Don't expose your institution to adverse consequences that can be avoided.

The Sponsoring Associations

- American Association of State Colleges and Universities
- American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education
- Council of Independent Colleges
- National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities
- State Higher Education Executive Officers

The Contributing Higher Education Systems

- California State University
- Illinois Consortium: Illinois Board of Higher Education
- Illinois State Board of Education
- Illinois Community College Board
- Mississippi Institutions of Higher Learning
- State University of New York
- University of North Carolina
- University System of Georgia

The Policy Council

- Molly Corbett Broad (Chair), President, University of North Carolina
- Penelope Earley, Vice President, Governmental Relations and Issue Analysis, American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education
- Jon Fuller, Senior Fellow, National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities
- Marilyn Guy, Professor, Department of Education, Concordia College, Minnesota
- Burnett Joiner, President, Livingstone College, North Carolina
- Thomas Layzell, Commissioner of Higher Education, Institutions of Higher Learning, Mississippi
- Nicholas Michelli, University Dean for Teacher Education, City University of New York
- James Mingle, Executive Director, State Higher Education Executive Officers
- Kenneth Poole, Dean, Graduate Affairs, Western Maryland College



- Charles Reed, Chancellor, California State University
- Keith Sanders, Executive Director, Illinois Board of Higher Education
- Donald Warren, University Dean, School of Education, Indiana University

Project Coordinator

- John Hammang, Director of Special Projects and Development, American Association of State Colleges and Universities

The Work Group Members

California

- Carol Barnes, Associate Director, Curriculum of CalState Teach, The California State University
- Rubin Espinosa, Professor, Policy Studies, San Diego State University
- Marsha Hirano-Nakanishi, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Analytic Studies, The California State University
- Alice Watkins, Dean, School of Education and Behavior Studies, Azusa Pacific University
- William Wilson, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Teacher Education and K-18 Programs, The California State University
- Ruth Yopp-Edwards, Professor, California State University-Fullerton
- Beverly Young, Director, Teacher Education and K-18 Program, The California State University

Connecticut

- Richard Arends, Dean, School of Education and Professional Studies, Central Connecticut State University

District of Columbia

- Buddy Blakey, Partner, Dean, Blakey and Moskowitz
- Thomas Wolanin, Research Professor of Education Policy and of Political Science, George Washington University

Florida

- Connie Hines, Associate Dean, Academic Affairs, University of South Florida
- Dennis Pataniczek (Work Group Leader), Associate Dean, College of Education, Florida Gulf Coast University,
- Hilda Rosseli, Assistant Dean, Undergraduate Programs, University of South Florida



Georgia

- Jan Kettlewell, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs, University System of Georgia
- Peggy Torrey, Executive Secretary, Professional Standards Commission

Illinois

- Julia Abell, Director, Planning and Institutional Studies, Eastern Illinois University
- Jan Ignash, Assistant Director, Academic Affairs, Illinois Board of Higher Education
- Genevieve Lopardo, Dean, College of Education, Chicago State University
- Sally Pancrazio, Dean, College of Education, Illinois State University
- Sally Vogl, Principal Consultant, Research and Policy Development, Illinois State Board of Education
- Connie Wise, Division Administrator for Research and Policy, Illinois State Board of Education

Indiana

- Dan Jeran, Director, Graduate Studies, Anderson University

Iowa

- John Hartung, President, Iowa Association of Independent Colleges

Kansas

- Gary Dill, President, McPherson College
- Cora Hedstrom, Director, University Relations, Emporia State University

Louisiana

- Lucindia Chance, Dean, College of Education, University of Louisiana at Lafayette

Maryland

- Javier Miyares, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs, University System of Maryland
- Nancy Shapiro, Director, Maryland K-16 Partnership, University System of Maryland

Massachusetts

- Susanne Chandler, Director, Department of Education, Massachusetts College of Liberal Arts



- Lynette Robinson-Weening, Director, Academic Policy, Massachusetts Board of Higher Education
- Bill Stokes, Professor, School of Education, Director, Literacy Institute, Lesley College

Michigan

- Mary Otto, Dean, School of Education and Human Services, Oakland University
- Jerry Robbins, Dean of the College of Education, Eastern Michigan University

Mississippi

- William Graves, Dean, College of Education, Mississippi State University
- Roy Ikenberry, Director, Institutional Research, Mississippi State University

Missouri

- Lloyd Richardson, Professor of Education, Division of Teaching and Learning, University of Missouri, St. Louis

New Jersey

- Ana Marie Schuhmann, Dean of Education, Kean University

New York

- Linda Biemer (Work Group Leader), Dean, School of Education and Human Development, State University of New York, Binghamton
- Jerrold Ross, Dean, School of Education and Human Services, St. John's University
- James Schwartz, Associate Professor of Education, Houghton College

North Carolina

- Charles Coble (Work Group Leader), Vice President, University School Programs, University of North Carolina

Ohio

- Jane Fullerton (Work Group Leader), Director, Education Initiatives & Grants Division, Ohio Board of Regents
- Gayle Trollinger (Work Group Leader), Associate Professor of Education, Bluffton College

Oklahoma

- Gene Stephenson, President, Oklahoma Association of Independent Colleges and Universities



Oregon

- John Tenny, Director, School of Education, Willamette University

Pennsylvania

- Susan Arisman (Work Group Leader), Dean, School of Education, Frostburg State University
- Philip Kerstetter, Dean of Education, Edinboro University of Pennsylvania
- Debbie Lynch, Special Education, Kutztown University of Pennsylvania
- Eva Travers, Professor of Education, Swarthmore College, Pennsylvania

Tennessee

- Mary Tanner, Dean of Education, University of Tennessee, Chattanooga
- Jane Williams, Professor, Educational Leadership, Middle Tennessee State University

Texas

- Richard Diem, Professor of Education, The University of Texas, San Antonio
- Jeanne Gerlach, Director of Education, University of Texas at Arlington
- Mary Valerio (Work Group Leader), University of Texas, Pan American

Vermont

- Lorna Duphiney Edmundson, President, Association Vermont Independent Colleges
- Barry Hertz, Director, State Teachers Standards, Lyndon State College

Virginia

- Rebecca Bowers, Director, Education, Curriculum and Instruction, Old Dominion University, Virginia
- Patricia Shoemaker (Work Group Leader), Assistant Dean, College of Education and Human Development, Radford University

Washington

- Violet Boyer, President, Washington Association of Independent Colleges and Universities
- Mark Pitts, Dean, School of Education, Seattle Pacific University

Wisconsin

- Karen Viechnicki, Dean, College of Education and Graduate Studies, University of Wisconsin, River Falls



ANALYTICAL CONTENTS FOR INSTITUTIONAL REPORTS

Introduction	17
Definition of Terms	17
Institutional Questionnaire	22
I. Pass Rates	22
A. Elements and Definitions	23
B. Calculation Protocols and Data Sources	25
C. Communication Recommendations	26
Table 1. Sequence of Pass-Rate Reporting	28
II. Program Information	29
A. Elements and Definitions	29
B. Calculation Protocols and Data Sources for Section III	32
C. Communication Recommendations	33
III. Contextual Information (optional detail)	33
A. Elements and Definitions	35
IV. Meeting the Publication Requirement	38
A. TPAEC's Recommendations: Information to Include in the Public Report	38
Table 2. The Publication Requirement	39
Table 3. Traditional Programs vs. Alternative Route Programs	40

B. Supplemental Information: Explaining the Reporting Methods Used in the Public Report	41
C. Recommendations on Communicating Effectively in the Public Report	43
D. Final Considerations	45
Sample Report Cards	46
A. Gatekeeper University	46
Table C1. Single-Assessment Institution-Level Pass-Rate Data	46
Table C2. Aggregate and Summary Institution-Level Pass-Rate Data	48
B. Exit College	54
Table C1. Single-Assessment Institution-Level Pass-Rate Data	54
Table C2. Aggregate and Summary Institution-Level Pass-Rate Data	56
C. Licensure State University	62
Table C1. Single-Assessment Institution-Level Pass-Rate Data	62
Table C2. Aggregate and Summary Institution-Level Pass-Rate Data	63



INSTITUTIONAL REPORTS

INTRODUCTION

The 1998 amendments to the Higher Education require institutions with teacher preparation programs to perform two tasks: to complete an annual institutional questionnaire about their teacher education program and to submit that report to the state; and to make information from the questionnaire public.

This section of this manual explains how to accomplish these tasks. Also included are recommendations about the content of the explanatory or contextual information that should accompany the publication of the institution's annual report, as required by Section 207(f)(2).

A set of model questionnaires included in this manual (pages 46-71) are designed to help state authorities and institutions with teacher preparation programs communicate what the public and policy makers should understand about these programs. The questionnaire complies with the statutory requirements and the definitions developed by the U.S. Department of Education. This manual will be distributed to government regulators, policy makers, and the institutions that are members of TPAEC's sponsoring associations.

We strongly urge that any information gathering conducted on an institution's teacher preparation program be a college-wide activity completed in collaboration with that institution's research office, public relations office, and others. This report should be the result of a university-wide effort. It should not be assigned only to the teacher education unit. If the creation of the report is the responsibility of individuals outside of teacher education, we recommend that the teacher education unit must be actively involved and consulted.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Understanding the following terms can help states and institutions with teacher preparation programs to complete their Institutional Report Cards and to publish those reports and contextual information. The following definitions are excerpted from the *Reference and Reporting Guide for Prepar-*



ing State and Institutional Reports on the Quality of Teacher Preparation, April 19, 2000 (NCES 2000-089) pages 40-42.

From the Reference and Reporting Guide

Academic Year: Any period of twelve consecutive months, as defined by the state.

Aggregate Pass Rate: See definition of “*Pass Rate*”.

Alternative Route to Certification or Licensure: As defined by the state.

Cohort of Program Completers: Individuals who met all the requirements of a state-approved teacher preparation program in a given *academic year*. (See definition of “*Program Completer*”.)

Cut Score: The minimum score required by the state to pass a teacher certification or licensure assessment.

Elementary School: [A] day or residential school that provides elementary education, as determined under state law. (See *section 14101(14) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act*.)

Initial Certification: As specified in the State Questionnaire, 1.c., as defined by the state.

Institution of Higher Education: Section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act provides a general definition of “institution of higher education,” as follows:

“For purposes of this Act, other than Title IV [Student Financial Assistance], the term ‘institution of higher education’ means an educational institution in any State that:

1. admits as regular students only persons having a certificate of graduation from a school providing secondary education, or the recognized equivalent of such a certificate;
2. is legally authorized within such State to provide a program of education beyond secondary education;
3. provides an educational program for which the institution awards a bachelor’s degree or provides not less than a two-year program that is acceptable for full credit toward such a degree;



4. is a public or other nonprofit institution; and
5. is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association, or if not so accredited, is an institution that has been granted preaccreditation status by such an agency or association that has been recognized by the Secretary for the granting of preaccreditation status, and the Secretary has determined that there is a satisfactory assurance that the institution will meet the accreditation standards of such an agency or association within a reasonable time."

Section 101(b) of the Higher Education Act further describes other institutions that are included under the definition of "institution of higher education".

"For purposes of this Act, other than title IV, the term 'institution of higher education' also includes:

1. any school that provides not less than a one-year program of training to prepare students for gainful employment in a recognized occupation and that meets the provision of paragraphs (1), (2), (4), and (5) of subsection (a); and
2. a public or nonprofit private educational institution in any State that, in lieu of the requirement in subsection (a)(1), admits as regular students persons who are beyond the age of compulsory school attendance in the State in which the institution is located."

Pass Rate: The percentage of program completers who passed assessment(s) taken for initial certification or licensure in the field of preparation.

- **Single Assessment Pass Rate:** The proportion of program completers who passed the assessment among all who took the assessment.
- **Aggregate Pass Rate:** The proportion of program completers who passed all the tests they took in each of six skill or knowledge areas, among all program completers who took one or more tests in each area.
- **Summary Pass Rate:** The proportion of program completers who passed all tests they took for their area of specialization among those who took one or more tests in their specialization areas.



Program Completer: A person who has met all the requirements of a state-approved teacher preparation program. Program completers include all those who are documented as having met such requirements. Documentation may take the form of a degree, institutional certificate, program credential, transcript, or other written proof of having met the program's requirements. In applying this definition, the fact that an individual has or has not been recommended to the state for initial certification or licensure may *not* be used as a criterion for determining who is a program completer.

Reporting to the General Public: Making the information in institutional and state reports available widely and publicly to members of the public interested in the performance of the institution's teacher preparation program. For institutions, this reporting includes providing the required information in publications such as "school catalogues and promotional materials sent to potential applicants, secondary guidance counselors, and prospective employers of the institution's graduates." (See section 207(f)(2) of Title II.)

Reporting to the State: Submitting annual institutional reports to the state agency, commission, or board—in the state in which the institution is located—that is responsible for preparing the state report under section 207.

Single Assessment Pass Rate: See definition of "Pass Rate".

Student: An individual enrolled in a teacher preparation program leading to an initial state teaching certificate or license.

Sufficient Content Knowledge: For a subject-area teacher, having "sufficient content knowledge" means that the teacher holds at least a bachelor's degree and demonstrates a high level of competency in all subject areas in which he or she teaches through:

1. completing an academic major in each of the subject areas in which he or she provides instruction, or
2. passing the state's assessments of subject-area knowledge (however a state chooses to define "passing" for this purpose).

Summary Pass Rate: See definition of "Pass Rate".



Supervised Practice Teaching: Practice teaching or internship in elementary or secondary schools required either by the state or the entity offering the program as a condition for completion of a teacher preparation program or for being considered for initial state licensure or certification and supervised by faculty as defined below.

Supervising Faculty: All persons who the institution regards as having faculty status, who were assigned by the teacher preparation program to provide supervision and evaluation of student teaching, and who have an administrative link or relationship to the teacher preparation program.

Teacher Certification/Licensure Assessment: A test or other structured method that measures the qualifications of prospective teachers, has a pass-fail outcome, and is used by the state for teacher certification or licensure.

Teacher Preparation Program: A state-approved course of study, the completion of which signifies that an enrollee has met all the state's educational or training requirements or both so as to be eligible for initial certification or licensure to teach in the state's elementary or secondary schools. A teacher preparation program may be either a regular program or an alternative route to certification, as defined by the state. Also, the program may be housed within or outside an institution of higher education.

In applying this definition, states and institutions may *not* determine that a teacher preparation program concludes after an individual has passed all examinations the state uses for initial certification or licensure, unless the state or institution requires that an individual pass these examinations before it will confer a degree, institutional certificate, program credential, transcript, or other proof of having met the program's requirements.

In addition, for the purpose of reporting, the *Reference and Reporting Guide* considers all regular teacher preparation programs at a single institution of higher education to be a single program.

Teaching Candidate: A completer of a teacher preparation program who has taken one or more assessments used by the state in which the program is located for initial teacher certification or licensure.

Test Closure Date: The date, specified by the state, after which test results will not be included in pass rates for an academic year cohort.



INSTITUTIONAL QUESTIONNAIRE

The following pages address the three sections of the Institutional Questionnaire: I. Pass Rates; II. Program Information; and III. Contextual Information, as well as an additional section on Meeting the Publication Requirement. Sections I and II follow the same general format: Elements and Definitions; Calculation Protocols and Data Sources; and Communication Recommendations. Section III addresses very important, but optional, Contextual Information.

For the purpose of interpreting the sample questionnaires within this manual TPAEC offers the following definitions which may be useful to help you individualize the mandated reporting data. These definitions classify institutions by when their state-required tests or assessments are administered.

Gatekeeper Institution

Some or all of the state-mandated tests are required prior to admission to a program or prior to a specified experience within a program (e.g., student teaching).

Exit Institution

All of the state-mandated tests are required for graduation or program completion or both.

Licensure Institution

All state-mandated tests are required for licensure/certification but not for graduation.

I. Pass Rates

This section provides guidance for completion of “Institutional-Level Pass Rate Data: Regular Teacher Preparation Program” found in Appendix C of the *Reference and Reporting Guide* (pp. 44-45). Table C.1 is for reporting Single Assessment information and Table C.2 is for reporting Aggregate and Summary information (see pp. 44-45 of the *Reference and Reporting*

Guide). An outline of the relevant elements and definitions needed to complete this table, provide calculation protocols and data sources (where appropriate), and offer communication recommendations to follow.

A. Elements and Definitions

The following definitions are taken from the *Reference and Reporting Reference and Reporting Guide for Preparing State and Institutional Reports on the Quality of Teacher Preparation*, April 19, 2000.

Note

Regarding the list of regular teacher preparation program completers for the academic year: (see p. 23 *Reference and Reporting Guide*) States may provide formats for this section. In the absence of guidance from the states, however, institutions should provide this information according to the format found in the *Reference and Reporting Guide* section of *Annual Institutional Reports: Sample Work Sheets and Reporting Rules* (see p. 25 *Reference and Reporting Guide*). See Tables 3 and 4 (p. 25 *Reference and Reporting Guide*)

Must I include students who finished the program but who were NOT recommended for licensure/certification by the college or university?

Explanation: Yes. Most data in the report is derived from completers. A “completer” is defined as a student who has completed all course requirements, field experiences, the culminating experience (student teaching or internship), etc.

Note: You must include all completers in your report even if the college or university does not recommend the candidate for licensure or certification.

Assessment Code Number: A number assigned by the testing agency or state. (see *Reference and Reporting Guide*, Appendix E, p. 72)

Late News

The Department of Education is revising Appendix E of the *Reference and Reporting Guide*. Check their web site for updates. See www.ed.gov/offices/OPE/News/teacherprep/.

Number Taking the Assessment: The number of candidates taking each assessment. **Note:** If the cell value is 10 or more, report that number in this category and in the Summary Assessment category. Do *not* display a number less than 10 in the annual report and do not display participation or pass rate calculations if their denominator is less than 10. (see *Reference and Reporting Guide* p. 11)

When one of the categories—Basic Skills, Professional Knowledge, or Subject/Content Knowledge—includes more than one assessment, include students who took any of the assessments within that category. Whereas the Basic Skills category and the Professional Knowledge category will generally include all program graduates in a given year, the

The *Reference and Reporting Guide* says: *Pass rates will be computed using the “rule of 10.”* In order for data on an assessment to be reported, there must be at least 10 program completers taking that assessment in an academic year. For aggregate or summary data, there must also be at least 10 program completers (though not necessarily taking the same assessment) for the data to be reported.



Subject/Content Knowledge assessments will be subsets of this number. It is important for institutions to determine the correct numbers of program graduates within each of these subsets.

Number Passing the Assessment: The percentage of individuals in a cohort of program graduates who took an assessment used by the state (or any assessment in a category of such assessments.)

Institutional Pass Rate: The U.S. Department of Education requires data on three types of institutional pass rates: single assessment pass rates, summary pass rates, and aggregate pass rates. (Computation guides are described in Section I, Pass Rates, B. Calculation Protocols and Data Sources, of this manual.)

Can a student be listed in the “pass” column without having passed all the state-required tests and therefore not be eligible for a teacher license or certificate?

Explanation: Students who have passed all the tests/subtest *taken* are considered to have passed. A student does not have to take all the state-required tests. (For example, student #8—depicted in Table 2, Calculating Aggregate and Summary Institutional Pass Rates [see p. 13 of the *Reference and Reporting Guide*—has not taken subtest #3 of the Basic Skills test. That student, however, will still be considered to be a “pass.”)

If a student has taken and failed *any* test or subtest, that student is listed as a “fail.” (For example, student #3—depicted in Table 2 Rates [see p. 13 of the *Reference and Reporting Guide*—has failed subtest #2 of Academic Content Area. Therefore, that student will be listed as a “fail.”) Both of these students will be considered to be “completers” even though neither is eligible for licensure or certification.

Single Assessment Pass Rate: The rate computed from the denominator and numerator described as follows:

- **Denominator**—The number of individuals in a cohort of program graduates who took a given assessment used by the state for initial teacher certification or licensure.
- **Numerator**—The number of graduates (found in the denominator) who passed that assessment, according to the state’s criterion for passing at the time the assessment was taken.

Summary Pass Rate: The proportion of program completers who passed all the tests they took in their areas of specialization among those who took one or more tests in their specialization areas. Summary pass rates are based on all assessments that an individual needs to pass in order to become initially certified or licensed as a teacher in a given area of specialization in a state.

Aggregate Pass Rate: The proportion of individuals who completed the program and who passed all the tests they took in each of the following skill or knowledge areas, among all program completers who took one or more tests in each area: Basic Skills, Professional Knowledge, Academic Content Areas, Other Content Areas, Teaching Special Populations, and Performance Assessments.



Statewide Pass Rate: The pass rate compiled and supplied by the state to institutions. In most states, this pass rate will not be available in the first year of reporting.

B. Calculation Protocols and Data Sources

Assessment Code Number: These code numbers are provided by the state agency or commercial testing agency, generally either ETS or NES.

Note

Both ETS and NES have tables showing which assessments fall into which category—Basic Skills, Professional Knowledge, or Subject/Content Knowledge—for each state. Since this method varies from state to state, refer to these tables to determine which category to use for each test in your particular state. (These tables can be found in Appendix E of the *Reference and Reporting Guide*.)

Late News

The Department of Education is revising Appendix E of the Reference and Reporting Guide. Check their web site for updates. See www.ed.gov/offices/OPE/News/teacherprep/.

Number Taking Assessment: The number of program completers who took each code-numbered assessment. In gatekeeper or exit institutions, more students will have taken some of the assessments than the number of students who completed the program. Report only the number of students who completed the program **and** took the tests.

Note

These figures are reported to the institution by the state agency or testing agency. It will be important for institutions to cross-check these figures to determine if each reported test-taker is indeed one of that institution's program completers. It is also important to verify that the particular subject/content area test taken is in an area that the student completed. If the number of students taking any assessment is less than 10, do *not* report pass scores for that assessment.

Institutional Pass Rate: These figures are reported to the institution by the testing agency in those states that use commercial tests or by the states that use state tests. The term *Institutional Pass Rate* refers to the percentage of students who pass the tests.



Single-Assessment Pass Rates: (Compute rounded to the nearest whole number.)

- A/B where
- A = the number of graduates (as extracted from the denominator) who passed the assessment, according to the state's criterion for passing each assessment at the time the assessment was taken; and
- B = the number of individuals in a cohort of program graduates who took a given assessment used for initial teacher certification or licensure by the state

Statewide Pass Rates: These figures are reported to the institution by the testing agency if commercial tests are used or by the state if state tests are used. Statewide reports may not be available in the first reporting year.

Summary Pass Rate: A summary measure of program effectiveness. Cell sizes of less than 10 *are included* in this number.

- C/D where
- C = the number of graduates who passed all the tests they took; and
- D = the number of graduates who took one or more tests within their area of specialization in tests used by the state

Performance Assessment: Rows are provided at the bottom of the Institutional-Level Pass-Rate Data form for "Performance Assessment." If a state requires portfolios or another type of "nontraditional" assessment, the percentage of individuals who pass these assessments must be reported in these rows.

C. Communication Recommendations

The completion of Tables C1 and C2 of the Institutional-Level Pass-Rate Data form (see *Reference and Reporting Guide*, p. 44–45) is straightforward and offers no options for customizing the type of information that is submitted to the state. However, these same data must be reported to the public and the way in which that information is presented can have a



major impact on what is communicated. For those institutions that have assigned individuals *other* than from the teacher-education unit to develop this public report, it is advisable to consult and involve that unit, so programmatic strengths will be highlighted. Several areas of possible concern follow:

- Be brief when describing these pass rates in the public report. Although the pass rates on state-required assessments seem to be efficient and simple measures of program accountability, they offer very limited information in terms of the entire program. At a minimum, these pass rates should be presented *following* a narrative description of the program.
- In some cases, data can hide features of the program that the institution wishes to highlight. For example, an institution that has targeted its program to the needs of a special student population may want to emphasize this fact. Since the data reported to the state are aggregated, this institution may benefit by disaggregating the data in its public report to show the successes of a particular population as compared to the performance of similar students at other institutions.
- Institutions need to understand that the state must use the Institutional Questionnaire data to produce “adjusted quartile” rankings of the teacher-preparation institutions within the state (see *Reference and Reporting Guide* Appendix F). In states that do not regulate the time in the program when the tests are administered, some institutions (such as Gatekeeper Institutions) may use the tests *within* the program, resulting in pass rates of 100 percent. Other institutions (such as Exit Institutions) may use the tests after the program has been completed. In this case, these institutions may receive a lower ranking because if students who were not screened out of the program prior to program completion fail the test. The reason for this lower ranking should be explained in the public report.
- Institutions and states will eventually report on two cohorts each year. In their first annual reports (which are due on April 7, 2001), institutions will be reporting to states—and states will later report to the



Secretary of Education—on the 1999-2000 cohort of program completers. In April 2002 and April 2003, respectively, institutions will report on the next two cohorts of program completers. (see p. 11 of the *Reference and Reporting Guide* for an example of this process)

In April of 2004, institutions will need to report on those students who completed their programs in 2002–2003. However, they will *also* need to update the initial pass-rate data on the 1999–2000 cohort. Thereafter, every institutional report (and the portion of every state report containing institutional pass rates) will include both pass rates on the most recent cohort of completers and updated pass rates on the cohort that finished the program three years earlier. This same sequence applies to the state’s reporting on the pass rates of two cohorts of program completers: those who used alternative routes to certification and licensure. Table 1, the Sequence of Pass-Rate Reporting, illustrates this pattern.

This form, which updates pass-rate data, conforms to the requirements of Section 207 of Title II. A cohort’s pass rates can include the scores of its program completers on a certification or licensure examination that has been taken *after* the test closure date of the initial testing period because a cohort’s pass rate must be updated in the third year after the initial report.

If the number of students taking any particular assessment is less than 10 in a reporting year, pass rates for that assessment are averaged over

Table 1. Sequence of Pass-Rate Reporting

Report Year	Cohort of 1999-2000	Cohort of 2000-2001	Cohort 2001-2002	Cohort of 2002-2003
2001	Pass Rates			
2002		Pass Rates		
2003			Pass Rates	
2004	Updates			Pass Rates
2005		Updates		
2006			Updates	
2007				Updates

Table from Reference and Reporting Guide p. 11



a three-year period. These students are included in the Number Taking the Assessment, the Assessment Participation Rate, and the Summary Assessment Category. The statute has specified this number of 10 students in a reporting year in order to protect the privacy of students in small programs. When institutions have small programs, they may want to describe these programs in detail in the section on Contextual Information.

II. Program Information

The information requested in Section II of the Institutional Questionnaire focuses on students, faculty, student teaching model(s), and program approval. Required elements and their definitions follow. Recommendations to improve communications to the public are also included.

A. Elements and Definitions

Supervised Student Teaching

(see *Reference and Reporting Guide* pp. 46–47).

Report the number of students in teacher preparation programs at your institution during 1999–2000.

Explanation: The number of students who are enrolled and fully admitted to your teacher education program and who have taken courses during the reporting period. This figure does not include those students who have declared intent to enter the teacher education program.

Report the number of students in programs of supervised student teaching during 1999–2000.

Explanation: The number of students who were enrolled in supervised student teaching—in the regular program and any alternative

Who are our students?

Explanation: These definitions should be considered in reporting.

- **Enrolled:** Students who have been fully admitted to the teacher education program. These students have met state and university requirements for admission.
- **Completers:** Students who have completed all course requirements, field experiences, the culminating experience (student teaching/internship), etc. Most data are reported on completers.

Note: Do **not** report students who have expressed a desire to become teachers but who have not met either state admissions requirements to the teacher education program or university admissions requirements to this program. You **must include** all completers of your program in your report even if the college or university does not recommend the candidate for licensure or certification.



What are “alternative routes/programs?”

Explanation: Alternative programs are defined by the state. Determining which programs are considered to be “alternative” must be a collaborative decision made by stakeholders in teacher education and stakeholders at the state level.

route programs¹—during the report period. This number should not include students in coursework that requires additional field experience or in practica that precede student teaching. The number could include students enrolled in a variety of student teaching models, including internships or professional development schools as well as the traditional student teaching.

Report the number of supervising faculty who were:

- appointed to serve as full-time faculty in professional (higher) education—an individual who works full-time in a school/college/department of education and spends at least part of the time in supervision of teacher preparation students—or
- appointed to serve as part-time faculty in professional education and full-time in the institution.

Explanation: Report any full-time faculty member in the institution who may be supervising or teaching in the teacher preparation program. The most likely example of this type of individual would be a professor in the school of liberal arts who also supervises student teachers in his/her area of expertise. The *Reference and Reporting Guide* (pp. 41 and 46) further indicates that these should be individuals the institution reports as having faculty status.

- appointed part-time faculty in professional education, not otherwise employed by the institution—individuals who may be part-time university faculty or P-12 teachers who supervise prospective teachers.

Explanation: TPAEC interprets this requirement to mean that the number should **not** include elementary and secondary teachers who simply receive a stipend for supervising student teachers. Rather, this third category is intended to reflect the growing trend of higher

¹Check with your state coordinator for Title II report crds to decide if the state or your institution will report on persons in an alternative route program. The state is authorized to make this decision.



education institutions to appoint elementary and secondary teachers as clinical faculty. The *Reference and Reporting Guide* (pp. 41 and 46) indicates that these should be individuals the institution reports as having the rights and responsibilities of the institution's regular faculty. TPAEC interprets this to include those individuals who have final authority for summative evaluation of student teacher performance.

Report the total number of supervising faculty for the teacher preparation program who supervised in these programs of supervised student teaching, or its equivalent, during the period of this report.

Explanation: Add all the figures in Section II.B.3 of the Institutional Questionnaire (see p. 46 of the *Reference and Reporting Guide*) to arrive at the total number of supervising faculty for the teacher preparation program during 1999-2000.)

Report the student-faculty ratio.

Explanation: Divide the number given in Section II.B.2, the number of students in supervised student teaching, by the sum of the numbers in B.3, the total number of supervising faculty for the teacher preparation program during 1999-2000.)

Note

You may want to address student teaching supervision in Section III, Contextual Information, of this manual.

Report the average number of hours per week of student participation in supervised student teaching in these programs. (see Section II.B.5)

Explanation: *A* hours. The total number of weeks per term of supervised student teaching was *B* weeks. (If more than one term, quarter or semester, was involved, please multiply the number of weeks per term by the number of terms.)



Note

The question asks for both the average number of hours per week plus the number of weeks, thereby creating a total number-of-hours figure.

Am I allowed to submit a separate report for each state-approved program?

Explanation: No, multiple programs must be regarded as a single program. On page 9 of the *Reference and Reporting Guide* is the following statement:

The *Reference and Reporting Guide* says (p.9) "Institutions must report pass rates on teacher assessments for all program completers of their regular teacher preparation programs. Program completers of an institution of higher education include all graduates who have met the requirements of its teacher preparation program and all others who are documented as having met those requirements."

State Approval or Accreditation of Teacher Preparation Programs

Is your teacher preparation program currently approved or accredited by the state? (see Section II.C.6)

Explanation: Answer "yes" or "no".

Is your teacher preparation program currently under a designation as "low performing" by the state (as per Section 208 (a) of the HEA of 1998)? (see Section II.C.7)

Explanation: Answer "yes" or "no." The definition and designation of "low performing" teacher preparation institution is defined by each state, using criteria developed by the state education agency responsible for program approval in consultation with institutions of higher education.

Note

State agency personnel may think they must rely solely on pass rates to determine which institutions are 'low performing. The law does not require such a standard (see Appendix A of this manual Section 208(a) and the discussion of this issue in the State Report section of this manual).

B. Calculation Protocols and Data Sources for Section III

The data source for questions in this section can be found in institutional records.

Total Faculty who Supervise Student Teachers (**from Section II.B.3**)

$$3a + 3b + 3c = B,$$

where

3a = appointed faculty who are employed full-time in higher education,



3b = appointed faculty who are employed part-time in education and full-time in the institution,

3c = appointed faculty who are employed part-time in education and not otherwise employed by the institution. This category includes university supervisors, graduate assistants, and P-12 teachers who have summative evaluation responsibility.

B = the sum of 3a, 3b, and 3c

Student-Faculty Ratio (from Section II.B.4)

A/B ,

where

A = the number of students in a student teaching program; and

B = the number of faculty who supervise student teachers

C. Communication Recommendations

Communication recommendations are intended to explain and create context for the information reported in the Institutional Questionnaire. Most of this information should be reported as described in Section III, Contextual Information, of this manual.

III. Contextual Information (optional detail)

This section of the Institutional Questionnaire provides additional information about teacher preparation programs. Contextual information is not required by Title II, but may provide critical information that describes the unique aspects of your teacher preparation program and should be attended to carefully. Individual states may specify which elements of contextual information are required as part of the institutional report to the state.

The U.S. Secretary of Education must file an annual report to Congress on the results of the institutional and state annual reports. The Secretary must have information about the quality of teacher preparation programs and

What if you have multiple field-experience models and student teaching models that will yield unclear data?

Explanation: This question is a good example of when you should respond with contextual information. Avoid allowing others to draw conclusions about your program based on unclear or incomplete information. Include clear but concise explanations in the contextual section of your report.



efforts to improve the quality of teacher preparation programs. Much of this information can be derived only from the contextual information provided by institutions and the states. Without the systematic reporting of contextual information, the Secretary can only rely on the quantitative data provided in the institutional reports.

States and institutions are not limited to the categories of supplemental information offered in the *Reference and Reporting Guide* (see p.8). This manual helps illustrate aspects of your program that are not necessarily explained by numerical calculations (e.g., student-to-faculty ratios in the supervision of student teachers that vary based on models such as traditional student teaching, internships, and professional development schools). Information in this section suggests ways to describe characteristics of the student population (e.g., graduate-only programs, socioeconomic status, English as a Second Language students) that may have an impact on the data.

Additional information provided by your university may be included, so the reader has contextual information that might not otherwise be included in the report. This additional information should be concise, descriptive, and limited to those elements that help the reader better understand your teacher preparation program.

As universities develop their public reports, they may present the contextual or qualitative data first. Doing so would provide a context for the numerical calculations reported in the Institutional Questionnaire (Institutional Report Card). Universities may use this opportunity to fully, but concisely, describe their teacher preparation programs.

What can a state require beyond the federal requirements?

Explanation: States are limited by their own statutory authority. It is not unusual, however, that during the approval process of teacher education programs, a state can require more than the information contained in this document.

Institutions may also include items that have not been described in this manual but which help tell the story of the unique or particularly effective components of their teacher preparation program. In addition, state agencies may require additional data that will be forwarded to the U.S. Secretary of Education.



A. Elements and Definitions

Elements

Contextual elements may include, but are not limited to, the following items.

Program or University Mission. A university's mission may affect performance data, program data or both. For example, universities with an urban mission may have high numbers of nontraditional students, first-generation college students, or alternative licensure programs controlled by the university.

Characteristics of Student Population. Large enrollments of underrepresented populations may affect program data, test data or both.

Program Characteristics. Post-baccalaureate-only programs may yield a difference in program data, test data or both from that of master's-degree-only or bachelor's-degree-only programs. For example, differences in data may result from the type of student teaching experience, prerequisite courses, etc.

Clinical Experiences. Describe the inclusion of the developmental nature of early field experiences, field experiences related to methods courses, and student teaching in this section. Outlining the number of hours in the total experience will clarify issues related to in-school requirements. Models may vary from traditional semester-long student teaching to full-year internships to professional development schools. Each model that is used by the teacher preparation program affect the data and should be described in this section.

Define models of student teaching at your institution. Different models may exist within an institution. Examples might include full-year internships, professional development school assignments, baccalaureate or fifth year, etc. The focus of this description and data is on the capstone experience.

Why should I devote time to the section on contextual information when it is optional?

Explanation: The Institutional, State, and Secretary's report cards should include more than pass rates and other data. The Secretary of Education's Report to Congress mandates that the Secretary compare the efforts of the states so as to ensure high-quality teacher preparation. Since the U.S. Department of Education has announced that it will not compare pass rates from state to state, it overlooks the question of what will be compared. Extensive descriptive information from each individual institution (via each state) is one possible source.



Describe the process through which supervisors are selected, trained, and evaluated.

Describe the supervision process utilized at your institution. For example, how many times does the university supervisor observe and evaluate each student teacher? What is the relationship between the classroom supervising teacher and the university supervisor? Who determines the final assessment of the student teacher's competency?

Explain the relationship of student teaching to other required clinical experiences.

Program and Student Teaching Admission Requirements. Describe State admission requirements or university admission requirements (or both) since the variation in requirements affect the outcomes.

Graduation or Program Completion Requirements. A narrative description of these requirements provides a comprehensive overview of the program that cannot be gleaned from the data.

Recruitment and Retention in the Program. Special programs and special services—or alternative programs for underrepresented populations or teacher shortage areas—should be described as part of the mission of the program or institution.

Alternative Routes/Programs (University). Describe any alternative program that creates a route to certification *and* is controlled by the university. The state, in consultation with institutions, will define alternate routes. This definition will determine the effect of university controlled alternate routes on pass rate data. They are included in student teaching data in any event.

Faculty Credentials and Characteristics. Emphasize the commitment of well-prepared faculty who have a thorough knowledge of, and involvement in, local schools where students are placed.



Regional and National Accrediting Information. Note your standing regarding national and regional accreditation because it demonstrates that the institution has met additional standards beyond the state and Title II requirements.

Other Evidence of Excellence. Include additional forms of evaluation such as follow-up studies, external assessments, the use of portfolios and other forms of authentic assessment that demonstrate program quality.

Definitions

For the purpose of interpreting the sample questionnaires presented in this manual, three TPAEC developed classifications are offered. Each is based on when the state-required tests or assessments are administered. In general, institutions can be classified as a ‘gatekeeper’ institution, an ‘exit’ institution, or a ‘licensure’ institution.

Gatekeeper Institution

Some or all of the state-mandated tests are required prior to admission to a program or prior to a specified experience within a program (e.g., student teaching).

Exit Institution

All of the state-mandated tests are required for graduation or program completion or both.

Licensure Institution

All state-mandated tests are required for licensure/certification but not for graduation.

The sample questionnaires in the Appendix of this manual represent these three categories. Contextual information appropriate for gatekeeper, exit, and licensure categories is included in the sample questionnaires. This will allow readers to focus on the example that best fits their institution.



IV. Meeting the Publication Requirement

Section 207(f)(2) of Title II of the Higher Education Act requires institutions to publish data submitted to the State on their teacher preparation programs and make it available to potential applicants, secondary school guidance counselors, and prospective employers of the institution's program graduates. It is not sufficient to merely submit the required information to the state on the annual Institutional Questionnaire. TPAEC recommends that institutions carefully consider as what information should be published and the format of the report.

While the pass rates on state-required assessments seem to be efficient and simple measures of program accountability, they offer very limited information in terms of the entire program. Therefore, be brief when describing these pass rates in the public report. At a minimum, these pass rates should be presented *following* a narrative description of the program.

To help institutions consider possible areas for supplemental information, TPAEC prepared a template (Table 2) that categorizes information as follows:

- information that must be included in the public report;
- information that should be included, per TPAEC recommendations; and
- supplemental information that will help the public understand the reporting methods of the public report.

A. TPAEC's Recommendations: Information to Include in the Public Report

The Secretary's Report to Congress mandates that the Secretary compare the states' efforts to improve their teacher education programs in order to ensure high-quality teacher preparation. Since the U.S. Department of Education has announced that it will not compare pass rates from state to state (and TPAEC applauds that decision), it begs the question as to what data might be compared.

**Table 2. The Publication Requirement**

Item	Include in Annual Questionnaire	Include in Required Publication
I. Pass Rates (see Tables C1 and C2 of the <i>Reference and Reporting Guide</i>)		
Academic Year	FR	FR
No. Program Completers	FR	FR
Assessment Codes	FR	FR
No. Taking Assessment	FR	FR
No. Passing Assessment	FR	FR
Institutional Pass Rate: Individual Assessment	FR	FR
Performance Assessments	FR ²	FR ³
Institutional Pass Rate: Aggregate Assessment	FR	FR
Institutional Pass Rate: Summary Assessment	FR	FR
Statewide Pass Rate ⁴	FR	FR
II. Program Information (see Appendix C of the <i>Reference and Reporting Guide</i>)		
No. Students Enrolled	FR	FR
No. Student Teachers	FR	—
Total No. of Supervising Faculty	FR	—
Faculty-to-Student Ratio	FR	FR
No. of Hours of Student Teaching	FR	FR
Accredited Program: Y/N	FR	FR
Low-Performing Program: Y/N	FR	FR
III. Supplemental Information⁵		
Mission/Vision Statement	IO	IO
Program Description	IO	IO
Best Practices	TA	TA
Performance Assessment Description	TA	TA
Recruitment and Retention Data	IO	IO
Admission and Retention Criteria	IO	IO
Disaggregated Data	IO	IO
Characteristics of Student Population	IO	IO
Completer Employment Rates and Career Longevity	TA	TA
Faculty Credentials	IO	IO
State and National Accrediting Information	IO	IO
Criteria for Selecting Supervisors	IO	IO

²Required if performance assessments are required for licensure.

³Ibid.

⁴This information is not required in the first year of the reporting requirement.

⁵Federal statute does not require the reporting of contextual or supplementary information. However, some states may require these items or additional data. It is strongly recommended that institutions present contextual information in the reports they submit to both their state and to the public.

Key

FR = *Federal Requirement* refers to data that must be included because it is required by the government.

TA = *TPAEC-Advised Data* refers to those items that TPAEC believes will provide a base of national information to the U.S. Secretary of Education, so the Secretary can compare statewide efforts to improve teacher preparation programs.

IO = *Institutional Option* refers to information submitted by institutions that TPAEC believes may be useful in explaining an institution's programs and pass-rate results. This data, however, does not contribute to the state or federal reports that might draw conclusions from this optional information.



Whatever information the Secretary chooses for this comparative report, the data will be derived primarily from the annual reports filed by the institutions and the states. The extensive descriptive information submitted to the Secretary by each state is one obvious source of data. That data, however, will probably not help answer the larger questions being raised in the political arena concerning content knowledge, classroom management skills, or ability to teach diverse students. Consequently, the type and scope of the data the law requires to be submitted by institutions and states presents the Secretary with a reporting dilemma. At the same time, institutions and states are given a special opportunity to supply the Secretary with supplementary, contextual data. The Secretary should be able to draw on data from the annual reports submitted by states and institutions to prepare the Secretary's Report to Congress. The supplementary information submitted by states and institutions should be selected to help the Secretary conduct the required comparison of the quality of teacher preparation programs.

To be useful, the supplementary information that is reported by institutions and states needs to be focused. This information should relate to the Secretary's charge to report to Congress. It should also help answer questions about how the quality in teacher preparation programs has improved and how traditionally prepared teachers compare to those teachers who have been prepared via alternative routes. In addition, the information should explain how the programs of teacher preparation are structured, how only appropriate individuals present themselves for licensure or are licensed, and how these programs serve the public at large.

Institutions are encouraged to prepare and submit a report of pass rates that conforms to Table 3, Traditional Programs vs. Alternative Route Programs, (which follows this paragraph) so states will be enabled to do

Table 3. Traditional Programs vs. Alternative Route Programs

	IHE-based	Non-IHE-based
Traditional Programs		
Alternative Route Programs		

IHE = Institutions of Higher Education



the same. The table provides more information than is required by the *Reference and Reporting Guide* because this supplementary data helps the state and the Secretary determine the alternative route programs for which institutions of higher education are responsible.

B. Supplemental Information: Explaining the Reporting Methods Used in the Public Report

The following list outlines some of the issues that could best be explained to the public through the use of supplemental information.

Disaggregating Data to Highlight Program Strengths

In some cases, data can hide features of the program that the institution wishes to highlight. For example, an institution that has targeted its program to the needs of a special student population may want to emphasize this fact. Since the data reported to the state are aggregated, this institution may benefit from disaggregating the data in its public report to show the successes of a particular population as compared to the performance of similar students at other institutions.

Explanations of State Rankings

Institutions need to understand that the state must use the Institutional Questionnaire data to produce “adjusted quartile” rankings of the teacher-preparation institutions within the state. In states that do not regulate the point in the program when the tests are used, some institutions (such as Gatekeeper Institutions) may use the tests *within* the program, resulting in pass rates of 100 percent. Other institutions (such as Exit Institutions) may use the tests after the program has been completed. In this case, these institutions will receive a lower ranking because students who fail the test were not screened out of the program prior to program completion. The reason for this lower ranking must be explained in the public report.

Explanations of Updates of Pass Rates

Another concern in terms of public reporting arises from the fact that students may take (and retake) the tests up to three years following the year in which they complete the program. Thus, institutions will publish pass rates for the current cohort as well as an “update” for an



earlier cohort. The pass rates for the earlier cohort will usually be higher than the pass rate for the current year because students who failed the test the first time(s) may have retaken the test and passed it. The reporting method could give the impression that an institution's program is declining in quality over time. We recommend that institutions include an explanation of this feature of the data.

Explanations of Students who Test Out-of-State

Any institution that has graduates who apply for certification in a state other than the one in which the institution has its approved program has a special reporting problem. Since the state functions as the clearinghouse for data, data from students who are certified in other states are not reported back to the institutions. If the test used by the institution's home state is the same test that a student takes elsewhere, the data could be included—and the home state's cut score could be applied—if the data were available to the institution. If students graduate but do not take any of the home-state tests, these students are not included in the institutional pass rates. Since some of the institution's best students may be going out of state, this reporting method could negatively affect the institution's summary pass rate.

Students who Test Out-of-Field (Don't explain them . . . throw the scores out)

At times, students take tests in a field outside their area of preparation in order to expand their areas of certification. During an institution's opportunity to verify the accuracy of scores included and calculations made, these test scores should be eliminated and calculations should be rerun. This is why the list of program completer contains the student's area of preparation and/or specialization.

Explanations of a Variety of Internship and Student Teaching Models

Some institutions have a variety of student teaching programs that build on other clinical experiences. Student teaching or field experience programs may vary in length, the amount of student involvement, or the type of faculty supervision. These factors may obscure



the nature and scope of the total student teaching program at a single institution. A concise but complete description should be included.

Recommendations as to how to describe internship and student teaching models follow.

- Define models of student teaching at your institution. Different models may exist within an institution. Examples could include full-year internships, professional development school assignments, post-baccalaureate or fifth year, alternate route programs or others. Focus both the data and the description on the capstone experience.
- Describe the process through which supervisors are selected, trained, and evaluated. Highlight the strengths of the individuals who supervise student teachers.
- Describe the supervision process used at your institution. For example, how many times does the university supervisor observe and evaluate each student teacher? What is the relationship between the classroom supervising teacher and the university supervisor? Who determines the final assessment of the student teacher's competency?
- Explain the relationship of student teaching to other required clinical experiences.

C. Recommendations on Communicating Effectively in the Public Report

Before developing your institution's public report, determine which information about your teacher education program can best be illustrated through graphics. What data can be reproduced in pie charts, bar graphs, time lines, and photographs? Remember that good photographs can tell a story in a way that words can seldom match.

Research reveals that few of us will read most of what is written. In reference to newspapers, statistics from the Poynter Institute show that 61



percent of readers scan the paper, 80 percent read the headlines, and 60 percent read the subheads. Only 40 percent of readers actually start at the first paragraph, and they read four paragraphs before deciding whether to complete the article. Readership drops to single digits (less than 10 percent) by the fifth paragraph.

Most of us feel a sense of accomplishment when we fill a page with multisyllable words. In contrast, the average reader glances at a gray, word-filled page and immediately goes to the headlines and the captions of photographs. Yet the average reader *can* be enticed to read more of your words. Ask your design professionals for their advice.

How do you encourage more people to read your copy more frequently?

- Avoid wordiness. Write short, crisp sentences.
- Avoid jargon, an example of which follows. “Despite rigid reexamination of all experimental variables, this protocol continued to produce data at variance with our subsequently proven hypothesis.” (Translation: The experiment did not work.).
- Use captions to describe your photographs. This text is widely read.
- Consider using color-tinted boxes, which increase readership by 11 percent.
- Use headlines, pull quotes, and summaries to help draw the readers into your copy.
- Avoid sexism and discrimination in your publication by presenting a representative depiction of students and faculty in your teacher education program. Include women, minorities, and individuals with disabilities in your photographs and program descriptions.

Be prepared to discuss the following factors with your publications professionals:

- The purpose of the publication (to inform, persuade, etc.).



- The intended audience (alumni, parents, potential students, legislators, or others).
- When delivery is required.
- The format (flier, brochure, poster).
- The quantity required.
- How the piece will be distributed (self-mailer, mailed in an envelope, for display only, etc.).
- How long the publication will be in circulation (Will it be reprinted annually?).
- Copy, art, and photography needs.
- The budget.

D. Final Considerations

Institutions may want to include additional items in the public report that have not been described in this manual. Determine whether this supplemental information will help relay the unique or particularly effective components of your teacher preparation program. In addition, state agencies may require additional data that have not been discussed here.



SAMPLE REPORT CARDS

A. Gatekeeper University

I. Pass Rates

Table C1. Single-Assessment Institution-Level Pass-Rate Data: Regular Teacher Preparation Program

Institution Name: Gatekeeper University • Academic Year: 1999–2000 • Number of Program Completers: 200

Type of Assessment	Assessment Code Number	No. of Students Taking Assessment	No. of Students Passing Assessment	Institution Pass Rate	Statewide Pass Rate
Basic Skills*					
CBEST: Reading		200	200	100%	
CBEST: Writing		200	200	100%	
CBEST: Math		200	200	100%	
and/or Additional "Basic Skills" Tests Per State Requirements					
Professional Knowledge*					
Professional Knowledge		200	200	100%	
and/or Additional "Professional Knowledge/Pedagogy" Tests per State Requirements					
Academic Content Areas*					
(Math, English, Biology, etc.)					
English Language, Literature and Composition: Essays		25	25	100%	
Language, Literature and Composition: Content Knowledge		25	25	100%	
Mathematics: Content Knowledge		15	15	100%	
Mathematics: Proofs, Models and Problems 1		15	15	100%	
Mathematics: Proofs, Models and Problems 2		15	15	100%	
Social Studies: Content Knowledge		50	50	100%	
Social Studies: Analytical Essays		50	50	100%	



Table C1. Single-Assessment Institution-Level Pass-rate Data: Regular Teacher Preparation Program
continued

Type of Assessment	Assessment Code Number	No. of Students Taking Assessment	No. of Students Passing Assessment	Institution Pass Rate	Statewide Pass Rate
Social Studies: Interpretation of Materials and/or Additional "Academic Content Areas" Tests per State Requirements		50	50	100%	
Other Content Areas*					
(Elementary Education, Career/Technical Education, Health Education, etc.)					
Elementary Education: Content Area Exercises		75	75	100%	
Elementary Education: Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment		75	75	100%	
and/or Additional "Other Content Areas" Tests per State Requirements					
Teaching Special Populations*					
(Special Education, ESL, etc.)					
Special Education: Knowledge-Based Core Principles		35	35	100%	
Special Education: Teaching Students with Learning Disabilities		35	35	100%	
and/or Additional "Special Populations" Tests per State Requirements					
Performance Assessments*					
Summary of Individual Assessments**		200	200	100%	

Key

*** Aggregate Pass Rate**

Numerator: The number of students who passed all the tests they took in a category (and within their area of specialization).

Denominator: The number of completers who took one or more test in a category (and within their area of specialization).

****Summary Pass Rate**

Numerator: The number of students who passed all the tests they took within their area of specialization.

Denominator: The number of completers who took one or more tests used by the state (and within their area of specialization).



**Table C2. Aggregate and Summary Institution-Level Pass-Rate Data:
Regular Teacher Preparation Program**

Type of Assessment	Assessment Code Number	No. of Students Taking Assessment	No. of Students Passing Assessment	Institution Pass Rate	Statewide Pass Rate
Aggregate: Basic Skills*		200	200	200/200 = 100%	
Aggregate: Professional Knowledge*		200	200	200/200 = 100%	
Aggregate: Academic Content Areas* (Math, English, Biology, etc.)		90	90	90/90 = 100%	
Aggregate: Other Content Areas* (Elementary Education, Career/Technical Education, Health Education, etc.)		75	75	75/75 = 100%	
Aggregate: Teaching Special Populations* (Special Education, ESL, etc.)		35	35	35/35 = 100%	
Aggregate: Performance Assessments*					
Aggregate: Summary of Individual Assessments**		200	200	200/200 = 100%	

Key

***Aggregate Pass Rate**

Numerator: The number of students who passed all the tests they took in a category (and within their area of specialization).

Denominator: The number of completers who took one or more test in a category (and within their area of specialization).

****Summary Pass Rate**

Numerator: The number of students who passed all the tests they took within their area of specialization.

Denominator: The number of completers who took one or more tests used by the state (and within their area of specialization).



II. Program Information

■ Number of Students in Teacher Preparation Programs at Your Institution

Please specify the number of students in your teacher preparation programs during 2000 (academic year 1999-2000, or most recent year available), including all areas of specialization.

- Total number of students enrolled during 1999-2000: 500

■ Information about Supervised Student Teaching

- How many students (in the regular program and any alternative route programs) were in programs of supervised student teaching during academic year 1999-2000? 206

- Please provide the numbers of supervising faculty who were:

10 Appointed full-time faculty in professional education: An individual who works full-time in a school, college, or department of education, and spends at least part of the time in supervision of teacher preparation students.

8 Appointed part-time faculty in professional education and full-time in the institution: Any full-time faculty member in the institution who may also be supervising or teaching in the teacher preparation program.

218 Appointed part-time faculty in professional education, not otherwise employed by the institution: May be part-time university faculty or elementary and secondary teachers who supervise prospective teachers. The numbers should *not* include elementary and secondary teachers who simply receive a stipend for supervising student teachers. Rather, this third category is intended to reflect the growing trend among institutions of higher education to appoint elementary and secondary teachers as clinical faculty, with the rights and responsibilities of regular faculty.



Supervising faculty for purposes of this data collection includes all persons who the institution regards as having faculty status and who were assigned by the teacher preparation program to provide supervision and evaluation of student teaching, with an administrative link or relationship to the teacher preparation program.

Total number of supervising faculty for the teacher preparation programs during 1999-2000: 236

- The student-to-faculty ratio was (Divide the total given in B.2. by the number given in B.3.): .8728. (see *Reference and Reporting Guide* Appendix C Section II, p. 46)
- The average number of hours per week of student participation in supervised student teaching in these programs was: 35 hours.

The total number of weeks of supervised student teaching is 15.

The total number of hours required is 525 hours.

■ **Information about State Approval or Accreditation of Teacher Preparation Programs**

- Is your teacher preparation program currently accredited or approved by the state? ☒ Yes ☐ No
- Is your teacher preparation program currently under a designation as low-performing by the state (as per Section 208 (a) of the HEA of 1998)? ☐ Yes ☒ No

Note

See Appendix A of the *Reference and Reporting Guide* for the legislative language that refers to low-performing programs.

III. Contextual Information (optional)

Please use this space to provide any additional information that describes your teacher preparation program(s). You may also attach information to this questionnaire.

**Note**

In addition to other unique features, programs that require that students take and pass all state-mandated tests in order to enter or continue in the program will have pass rates of 100 percent. In such cases, providing information about other aspects of the program will help create important contexts for the required information about student performance. Such contextual pieces may include some or all of the following suggestions or examples.

- **General University Description**

Example: Gatekeeper University is a private university located in the southwestern part of the United States. The university primarily serves a five-state region with a large, traditional four-year undergraduate program and post-baccalaureate teacher training programs.

- **Mission**

Universities may refer to their mission statements printed in the university's catalog and, if necessary, explain or discuss the impact of its mission on student passing rates.

Example: The mission of Gatekeeper University is to provide high-quality education to its teacher candidates in order to have a positive impact on student achievement and to advance the aims of a traditional society. All teacher candidates must pass required state-mandated tests in order to enter or to continue in various phases of the program.

- **Student Population**

Provide a narrative description of the student population particularly to the extent that it may impact pass rates on required assessments. Pass rates may be skewed depending on socio-economic factors and previous educational opportunities.

Example: To a large extent, teacher candidates at Gatekeeper University come from the surrounding community. The demographics of teacher candidates passing the entrance examination are comparable to the demographics of the larger university community.

- **Program Characteristics**

State-mandated tests are required for all teacher education candidates.

Example: Teacher candidates at Gatekeeper University must pass state-mandated tests either for admission to the program or continuation (e.g., student teaching). Therefore, a pass rate of 100 percent is to be expected. It is important to note that as many as 10 percent of the students who initially apply for licensure are not admitted or are counseled to leave the university due to a lack of skills, content knowledge, or other characteristics that have been deemed necessary for success as a classroom teacher. Additional screening checkpoints (such as interviews with faculty, successful performance in field experiences, or recommendations from university or elementary and secondary faculty) have been established.

- **Best Practices**

You may wish describe the best practices in your institution that are supported by educational research. Please refer to Section V. Appendix A. Supplemental Contextual Information Regarding Quality Improvement Efforts in the Preparing State Reports section of this manual for a fuller discussion of this issue.

Example: Gatekeeper University requires students to have a strong academic background with in the area in which they are preparing to teach. Gatekeeper University requires students to have an established partnership with a public school.

- **Admission Requirements**

Refer to your current university/school/college admission requirements for teacher education programs.

Example: Admission requirements include a GPA of 2.75 or higher; a letter of recommendation; successful scores on a basic skills examination (Praxis I); a minimum of a 3.0 GPA in freshman-level math and English courses; and an interview with faculty. In order for teacher candidates to be retained in the program, they must pass state-mandated examinations. Therefore, the pass rate for students continu-



ing or completing the program is 100 percent, even though 10 percent of students do not pass or continue.

- **Admission to Student Teaching**

Example: Admission to student teaching requires letters of recommendation from university and P-12 faculty members as well as a completed portfolio demonstrating competencies in content, pedagogy, and technology. In addition, students must make a satisfactory score on the content portion of the Praxis examination.

- **Supervised Student Teaching**

Example: Every student enrolled in supervised student teaching has two supervisors. One supervisor is a public-school teacher who supervises the student in the classroom on a daily basis. The second supervisor is a university faculty member who supervises several students. This supervisor visits and observes each of their students at least eight times during the semester when the students are teaching in the classroom. The ratio of faculty to student in supervised student teaching is 1:1.14.

- **Graduation Requirements***

Responding to this component provides another opportunity for programs to demonstrate their commitment to quality. Describe graduation requirements for students in your institution's teaching programs that are unique to your institution or system.

Example: The final screening procedures for graduation at Gatekeeper University are completed when students file their intent to graduate. Students must obtain a recommendation from their cooperating teacher in their student teaching placement, achieve satisfactory scores on the Professional Knowledge portion of the National Teachers Examination, and complete all coursework with a GPA of 2.75 or higher.

* Any student who fails to complete any screening procedure will not be reported as a program completer in this cohort. Instead, that student will be reported as a member of the cohort with whom he/she meets all the requirements.



B. Exit College

I. Pass Rates

Table C1. Single-Assessment Institution-Level Pass-Rate Data: Regular Teacher Preparation Program

Institution Name: Exit College • Academic Year: 1999–2000 • Number of Program Completers: 20

Type of Assessment	Assessment Code Number	No. of Students Taking Assessment	No. of Students Passing Assessment	Institution Pass Rate	Statewide Pass Rate
CBEST: Reading		20	20	100%	
CBEST: Writing		20	20	100%	
CBEST: Math		20	20	100%	
and/or Additional "Basic Skills" Tests Per State Requirements					
Professional Knowledge*					
Professional Knowledge		20	20	100%	
and/or Additional "Professional Knowledge/Pedagogy" Tests per State Requirements					
Academic Content Areas*					
(Math, English, Biology, etc.)					
English Language, Literature and Composition: Essays		25	25	100%	
Language, Literature and Composition: Content Knowledge		25	25	100%	
Mathematics: Content Knowledge		15	15	100%	
Mathematics: Proofs, Models and Problems 1		15	15	100%	
Mathematics: Proofs, Models and Problems 2		15	15	100%	
Social Studies: Content Knowledge		50	50	100%	
Social Studies: Analytical Essays		50	50	100%	



Table C1. Single-Assessment Institution-Level Pass-Rate Data: Regular Teacher Preparation Program
continued

Type of Assessment	Assessment Code Number	No. of Students Taking Assessment	No. of Students Passing Assessment	Institution Pass Rate	Statewide Pass Rate
Social Studies: Interpretation of Materials and/or Additional "Academic Content Areas" Tests per State Requirements		50	50	100%	
Other Content Areas*					
(Elementary Education, Career/Technical Education, Health Education, etc.)					
Elementary Education: Content Area Exercises		75	75	100%	
Elementary Education: Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment		75	75	100%	
and/or Additional "Other Content Areas" Tests per State Requirements					
Teaching Special Populations*					
(Special Education, ESL, etc.)					
Special Education: Knowledge-Based Core Principles		35	35	100%	
Special Education: Teaching Students with Learning Disabilities		35	35	100%	
and/or Additional "Special Populations" Tests per State Requirements					
Performance Assessments*					
Summary of Individual Assessments**		20	20	100%	

Key

*** Aggregate Pass Rate**

Numerator: The number of students who passed all the tests they took in a category (and within their area of specialization).

Denominator: The number of completers who took one or more test in a category (and within their area of specialization).

****Summary Pass Rate**

Numerator: The number of students who passed all the tests they took within their area of specialization.

Denominator: The number of completers who took one or more tests used by the state (and within their area of specialization).



**Table C2. Aggregate and Summary Institution-Level Pass-Rate Data:
Regular Teacher Preparation Program**

Type of Assessment	Assessment Code Number	No. of Students Taking Assessment	No. of Students Passing Assessment	Institution Pass Rate	Statewide Pass Rate
Aggregate: Basic Skills*		20	20	200/200 = 100%	
Aggregate: Professional Knowledge*		20	20	200/200 = 100%	
Aggregate: Academic Content Areas* (Math, English, Biology, etc.)		90	90	90/90 = 100%	
Aggregate: Other Content Areas* (Elementary Education, Career/Technical Education, Health Education, etc.)		75	75	75/75 = 100%	
Aggregate: Teaching Special Populations* (Special Education, ESL, etc.)		35	35	35/35 = 100%	
Aggregate: Performance Assessments*					
Aggregate: Summary of Individual Assessments**		20	220	200/200 = 100%	

Key

***Aggregate Pass Rate**

Numerator: The number of students who passed all the tests they took in a category (and within their area of specialization).

Denominator: The number of completers who took one or more test in a category (and within their area of specialization).

****Summary Pass Rate**

Numerator: The number of students who passed all the tests they took within their area of specialization.

Denominator: The number of completers who took one or more tests used by the state (and within their area of specialization).



II. Program Information

■ Number of Students in Teacher Preparation Programs at Your Institution

Please specify the number of students in your teacher preparation programs during 2000 (academic year 1999-2000, or most recent year available), including all areas of specialization.

- Total number of students enrolled during 1999-2000: 20

■ Information about Supervised Student Teaching

- How many students (in the regular program and any alternative route programs) were in programs of supervised student teaching during academic year 1999-2000? 20
- Please provide the numbers of supervising faculty who were
 - 2 Appointed full-time faculty in professional education: An individual who works full-time in a school, college, or department of education, and spends at least part of the time in supervision of teacher preparation students.
 - 2 Appointed part-time faculty in professional education and full-time in the institution: Any full-time faculty member in the institution who may also be supervising or teaching in the teacher preparation program.
 - 20 Appointed part-time faculty in professional education, not otherwise employed by the institution: May be part-time university faculty or pre-elementary and secondary teachers who supervise prospective teachers. The numbers should *not* include elementary and secondary teachers who simply receive a stipend for supervising student teachers. Rather, this third category is intended to reflect the growing trend among institutions of higher education to appoint elementary and



secondary teachers as clinical faculty, with the rights and responsibilities of regular faculty.

Supervising faculty for purposes of this data collection includes all persons who the institution regards as having faculty status and who were assigned by the teacher preparation program to provide supervision and evaluation of student teaching, with an administrative link or relationship to the teacher preparation program.

Total number of supervising faculty for the teacher preparation programs during 1999-2000: 24

- The student-to-faculty ratio was (Divide the total given in Section II.B.4. of the *Exit College Example* by the number given in Section II.B.3.): .8333.
- The average number of hours per week of student participation in supervised student teaching in these programs was: 40 hours.

The total number of weeks of supervised student teaching is 12.

The total number of hours required is 480 hours.

■ **Information about State Approval or Accreditation of Teacher Preparation Programs**

- Is your teacher preparation program currently accredited or approved by the state? X Yes No
- Is your teacher preparation program currently under a designation as low-performing by the state (as per Section 208 (a) of the HEA of 1998)? Yes X No

Note

See Appendix A of the *Reference and Reporting Guide* for the legislative language that refers to low-performing programs.



III. Contextual Information (optional)

Please use this space to provide any additional information that describes your teacher preparation program(s). You may also attach information to this questionnaire.

Note

In addition to other unique features, programs that require that students take and pass all state-mandated tests in order to enter or continue in the program will have pass rates of 100 percent pass rates. In such cases, providing information about other aspects of the program will help create important contexts for the required information about student performance. Such contextual pieces may include some or all of the following suggestions or examples.

- **General University Description**

Example: Exit College is a small, private college located in the north-western part of the United States. The college primarily serves a one-state region with a small, traditional four-year undergraduate teacher education program.

- **Mission**

Universities may refer to the catalog copy of their mission statement and, if necessary, explain or discuss the impact of its mission on student passing rates.

Example: The mission of Exit College is to provide high-quality education to its teacher candidates in order to have a positive impact on student achievement and to advance the aims of a traditional society. All teacher candidates must pass required state-mandated tests in order to be allowed to complete the teacher education program.

- **Student Population**

Provide a narrative description of the student population particularly to the extent that it may impact pass rates on required assessments. Pass rates may be skewed depending on socio-economic factors and previous educational opportunities.



Example: To a large extent, teacher candidates at Exit College come from the surrounding community. The college's students are predominately residential and would be classified as suburban. Ninety percent of students at the college are Caucasian.

- **Program Characteristics**

State-mandated tests are required for all teacher education candidates.

Example: Teacher candidates at Exit College must pass state-mandated tests either for admission to the program or for graduation. Therefore, a pass rate of 100 percent is to be expected. It is important to note that all state admission criteria are met prior to enrollment at Exit College due to the admission requirement of a high ACT score (e.g. 22).

- **Best Practices**

You may wish describe the best practices in your institution that are supported by educational research. Please refer to Section V. Appendix A. Supplemental Contextual Information Regarding Quality Improvement Efforts in the Preparing State Reports section of this manual for additional guidance and a fuller discussion of this issue.

Example: Exit College requires students to have a strong academic background in the area in which they are preparing to teach. Exit College requires students to have an established partnership with a public school.

- **Admission Requirements**

Refer to your current university/school/college admission requirements for teacher education programs.

Example: Admission requirements include a GPA of 2.75 or higher; a letter of recommendation; successful scores on a basic skills examination (Praxis I); at least a 3.0 GPA in freshman-level math and writing courses; and a personal interview with faculty members. The pass rate for students continuing or completing the program is 100 percent.



- **Retention Requirements**

Example: Students at Exit College must make satisfactory academic progress toward their degree. Students must maintain at least a 2.75 GPA, achieve a satisfactory performance in field-based assignments, and demonstrate professional behavior.

- **Admission to Student Teaching**

Example: Admission to student teaching at Exit College requires letters of recommendation from college and P-12 faculty members as well as a completed portfolio demonstrating competencies in content, pedagogy, and technology. In addition, students must make a satisfactory score on the content portion of the Praxis examination.

- **Supervised Student Teaching**

Example: For each student teacher at Exit College, two faculty members are assigned to supervise that student. One supervisor is a full-time, public school teacher who supervises the student in the classroom on a daily basis. The second supervisor is a university faculty member who supervises several students. This supervisor visits and observes each of their students at least eight times during the semester when the students are teaching in the classroom. The ratio of faculty to student in supervised student teaching is 1:1.2.

- **Graduation Requirements***

Responding to this component provides yet another opportunity for programs to demonstrate their commitment to quality. Describe graduation requirements for students in your institution's teaching programs that are unique.

Example: The final screening procedures for teacher preparation program majors at Exit College are completed when students file their intent to graduate. Students must obtain a recommendation from their cooperating teacher in their student teaching placement, achieve satisfactory scores on the Professional Knowledge portion of the National Teachers Examination, and complete all coursework with a GPA of 2.75 or higher.

* Any student who fails to complete any screening procedure will not be reported as a program completer in this cohort. Instead, that student will be reported as a member of the cohort with whom he/she meets all the requirements.



C. Licensure State University

I. Pass Rates

Table C1. Single-Assessment Institution-Level Pass-Rate Data: Regular Teacher Preparation Program

Institution Name: Licensure State University (an NES Test University)

Academic Year: 1999–2000 (Testing Period: 10/99–9/00 • Number of Program Completers: 128

Type of Assessment	Assessment Code Number	No. of Students Taking Assessment	No. of Students Passing Assessment	Institution Pass Rate	Statewide Pass Rate
Basic Skills*	96	113	109	109/113 =96.5%	
Assessment 1	96	113	109	109/113 =96.5%	
Assessment 2	NA				
Professional Knowledge*	NA				
Assessment 1	NA				
Academic Content Areas*	NA	17	10	10/17 = 58.8%	
Art (6-12)	51	2	1	1/2 = 50%	
Biology (6-12)	35	1	1	1/1 = 100%	
Chemistry (6-12)	37	2	2	2/2 = 100%	
English (6-12)	25	1	1	1/1 = 100%	
Mathematics (6-12)	36	6	3	3/6 = 100%	
Music (6-12)	52	3	1	1/3 = 100%	
Social Studies/Geography (6-12)	24	0	—	—	
Social Studies/History(6-12)	24	1	0	0/1 = 0%	
Spanish (6-12)	26	1	1	1/1 = 100%	
Other Content Areas*	NA	71	62	62/71 = 87.3%	
Early Childhood (PreK-3)	2	9	7	7/9 = 77.8%	
Elementary Education (K-9)	3	52	46	46/52 = 88.5%	
Business (6-12)	47	5	4	4/5 = 80%	
Industrial Technology(6-12)	45	0	—	—	
Physical Education (6-12)	53	1	1	1/1 = 100%	
Physical Education (K-12)	50	4	4	4/4 = 100%	
Teaching Special Populations*	—	24	20	20/24 = 83.3%	
Bilingual Elementary (K-9)	3	7	7	7/7 = 100%	
Educable Mentally Handicapped (K-12)	4	17	13	13/17= 76.5%	
Performance Assessments*	NA				
Summary of Individual Assessments*	NA				

Note

Shaded areas should not be displayed in the annual questionnaire because of the 'Rule of 10.' See *Reference and Reporting Guide* p. 11.

Key

* Aggregate Pass Rate

Numerator: The number of students who passed all the tests they took in a category (and within their area of specialization).

Denominator: The number of completers who took one or more test in a category (and within their area of specialization).

**Summary Pass Rate

Numerator: The number of students who passed all the tests they took within their area of specialization.

Denominator: The number of completers who took one or more tests used by the state (and within their area of specialization).



**Table C2. Aggregate and Summary Institution-Level Pass-Rate Data:
Regular Teacher Preparation Program**

Institution Name: Licensure State University

Academic Year: 1999–2000 (Testing Period: 10/99–9/00) • Number of Program Completers: 128

Type of Assessment	Assessment Code Number	No. of Students Taking Assessment	No. of Students Passing Assessment	Institution Pass Rate	Statewide Pass Rate
Aggregate: Basic Skills*		113	109	109/113 = 96.5%	
Aggregate Professional Knowledge*		NA			
Aggregate Academic Content Areas* (Math, English, Biology, etc.)		17	17	0/17 = 58.8%	
Aggregate Other Content Areas* (Elementary Education, Career/ Technical Education, health Education, etc.)		71	2	62/71 = 87.3%	
Aggregate Teaching Special Populations* (Special Education, ESL, etc.)		24	20	20/24 = 83.3%	
Aggregate Performance		NA			
Aggregate Summary of Individual Assessments**		119	89	89/119 = 74.8%	

Key

*** Aggregate Pass Rate**

Numerator: The number of students who passed all the tests they took in a category (and within their area of specialization).

Denominator: The number of completers who took one or more test in a category (and within their area of specialization).

****Summary Pass Rate**

Numerator: The number of students who passed all the tests they took within their area of specialization.

Denominator: The number of completers who took one or more tests used by the state (and within their area of specialization).



II. Program Information

■ Number of Students in Teacher Preparation Programs at Your Institution

Please specify the number of students in your teacher preparation programs during 2000 (academic year 1999-2000, or most recent year available), including all areas of specialization.

- Total number of students enrolled during 1999-2000: 425

■ Information about Supervised Student Teaching

- How many students (in the regular program and any alternative route programs) were in programs of supervised student teaching during academic year 1999-2000? 206

- Please provide the numbers of supervising faculty who were:

11 Appointed full-time faculty in professional education: An individual who works full-time in a school, college, or department of education, and spends at least part of the time in supervision of teacher preparation students.

8 Appointed part-time faculty in professional education and full-time in the institution: Any full-time faculty member in the institution who also may be supervising or teaching in the teacher preparation program.

5 Appointed part-time faculty in professional education, not otherwise employed by the institution: May be part-time university faculty or elementary and secondary teachers who supervise prospective teachers. The numbers should not include elementary and secondary teachers who simply receive a stipend for supervising student teachers. Rather, this third category is intended to reflect the growing trend among institutions of higher education to appoint elementary and secondary teachers as clinical faculty, with the rights and responsibilities of regular faculty.



Supervising faculty for purposes of this data collection includes all persons who the institution regards as having faculty status and who were assigned by the teacher preparation program to provide supervision and evaluation of student teaching, with an administrative link or relationship to the teacher preparation program.

Total number of supervising faculty for the teacher preparation programs during 1999-2000: 24

- The student-to-faculty ratio was (divide the total given in Section II.B.4. of the Licensure State University example by the number given in B.3.): 8.5.
- The average number of hours per week of student participation in supervised student teaching in these programs was: 35 hours.

The total number of weeks of supervised student teaching is 16.

The total number of hours required is 560 hours.

■ Information about State Approval or Accreditation of Teacher Preparation Programs

- Is your teacher preparation program currently accredited or approved by the state? ☒ Yes ☐ No
- Is your teacher preparation program currently under a designation as low-performing by the state (as per Section 208 (a) of the HEA of 1998)? ☐ Yes ☒ No

Note

See Appendix A of the Reference and Reporting Guide for the legislative language that refers to low-performing programs [Section 207(f)(1)(D)].

III. Contextual Information (optional)

Please use this space to provide any additional information that describes your teacher preparation program(s). You may also attach information to this questionnaire.



Note

In addition to other unique features, programs that require that students take one state mandated test (e.g. basic skills test) in order to be admitted to the program will have an aggregate basic skills pass rate of 100 percent. In such cases, providing information about other aspects of the program will help create important contexts for the required information about student performance. Such contextual pieces may include some or all of the following suggestions or examples. See pages 56-58 of this manual.

- **General University Description**

- **Mission**

Universities may refer to their mission statements printed in the university's catalog and, if necessary, explain or discuss the impact of its mission on student passing rates.

Example: Licensure State University is dedicated to urban education. The mission of the teacher preparation program is to prepare large numbers of teachers to work in urban schools.

- **Student Population**

Provide a narrative description of the student population particularly to the extent that it may impact pass rates on required assessments. Pass rates may be skewed depending on socio-economic factors and previous educational opportunities.

Example: Licensure State University devotes its resources primarily to recruiting and retaining under-represented student groups.

- **Program Characteristics**

State-mandated tests are required for all teacher education candidates.

- **Best Practices**

Describe the best practices in your institution that are supported by educational research. Please refer to Section V. Appendix A. Supplemental Contextual Information Regarding Quality Improvement Efforts in the Preparing State Reports section of this manual for additional guidance and a fuller discussion of this issue.

Example: The teacher preparation program at Licensure State University implements best practices acknowledged by leading researchers as key to preparing high-quality teachers.

- Faculty members at Licensure State University collaborate with their colleagues in teacher education to ensure the content they teach prepares students to teach to elementary and secondary standards.
- Field experiences in the institution's teacher preparation program are integrated into the entire teacher preparation program in order for students to assimilate the culture of teaching.
- Teacher candidates engage in a variety of learning activities in schools with children two to three years before they begin long-term supervised practice teaching.
- Teacher candidates, experienced classroom teachers, and faculty in Licensure State University learn from each other as they study their own beliefs and values about teaching and learning.

Note

In those states where no Best Practices/Standards for judging the quality of teacher preparation programs have been developed, both institutions and state officials may want to look to national guidelines.

- **Disaggregating Data**

Example: Licensure State University serves many nontraditional students such as older, working, and part-time students. By disaggregating students on the basis of age, Licensure State University can better describe the basis on which its state rankings have been formulated. Many institutions benefit from disaggregating data on the basis of ethnicity or on baccalaureate/post baccalaureate programs.

- **Admission Requirements**

Refer to your current university/school/college admission requirements for teacher education programs.



Example: Teacher preparation program applicants must take and pass the state mandated basic skills tests before they are admitted to teacher education programs.

- **Retention Requirements**

Example: Teacher candidates required to enroll in noncredit writing and language labs when faculty and/or field supervisors identify writing/language weaknesses. Teacher candidates must demonstrate proficiency in areas of weakness before they are dismissed from the labs.

- **Admission to Student Teaching**

Example: Licensure State University requires its teacher candidates to meet a minimum GPA and to present a portfolio to a faculty committee. In addition, all teacher candidates must have completed a one-semester internship.

- **Supervised Student Teaching**

Example: All teacher candidates at Licensure State University must complete student teaching in an urban public school to ensure that they are familiar with the context in which most of them will be teaching.

- **Graduation Requirements***

Responding to this component provides yet another opportunity for programs to demonstrate their commitment to quality. Describe graduation requirements for students in your institution's teaching programs that are unique.

Any student who fails to complete any screening procedure will not be reported as a program completer in this cohort. Instead, that student will be reported as a member of the cohort with whom he/she meets all the requirements.

* Any student who fails to complete any screening procedure will not be reported as a program completer in this cohort. Instead, that student will be reported as a member of the cohort with whom he/she meets all the requirements.

- **Institution Vision**

Example: Licensure State University views its teacher preparation program as multifaceted. As such, the university does not believe that



its program can be adequately evaluated by a single set of test scores. The university adds value to the profession of teaching and to its students in the following ways.

- Licensure State University is in the process of gathering data that will document the effectiveness of our students to enhance the learning of elementary and secondary students.
- The university graduates teachers who are able to empathize and identify with urban cultures.
- Graduates of the university's programs can help reduce the drop-out rates of elementary and secondary students.
- Graduates of Licensure State University remain in the education profession for a longer period of time, on average, than do graduates of other programs.
- The university's teacher candidates help develop character in their elementary and secondary students.



ANALYTICAL CONTENTS FOR STATE REPORTS

Introduction	71
General Commentary	71
Contextual Information	73
Terms that States Must Define or Use	74
The State Questionnaire	79
Linking Information to the Secretary of Education's Report to Congress	86
Definitions	88



STATE REPORTS

INTRODUCTION

TPAEC developed this section in consultation with representatives of state agencies and boards responsible for teacher credentialing. This manual specifically addresses those sections of the amendments that require statewide accountability. The commission and its work groups have carefully reviewed the requirements for states as found in Section 207(b) and Section 208 of the Higher Education Act of 1998. These sections direct each state to prepare a report on the quality of its teacher preparation Section 207(b) (1-9) and undertake other required functions related to low-performing programs of teacher preparation within institutions of higher education (Section 208).

This section provides general commentary on completing the state reports and specific commentary that addresses each section of the state report as provided by the U. S. Department of Education. The commission has also developed a manual to provide guidance for institutions in completing the institutional report Section 207(f)(1) and in publicizing information as required by Section 207(f)(2). This information is designed to be used as supplements to the U. S. Department of Education's *Reference and Reporting Guide for Preparing State and Institutional Reports on the Quality of Teacher Preparation*.

This section provides guidance and additional contextual analysis to those responsible for producing the state report and undertaking the required related activities. It also provides guidance to other individuals involved in teacher preparation programs. Its purpose is to increase institutional and state awareness of the potential impact that the reporting mechanisms may have on these two groups.

GENERAL COMMENTARY

The state report may appear to be a straightforward compilation of required criteria, standards, assessments, pass rates, and other types of information that reflect a state's teacher certification and licensure requirements. Because the report is federally mandated, however, it is the first time that Congress and the public at large will receive information in such



a way that will inevitably invite comparisons among states and between institutions.

The 50 states have significant differences in their governance structures for teacher certification and in their ways of assessing the readiness of potential teachers. Although the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) has consulted widely with interested parties throughout the country in developing definitions and reporting methods, it is very likely that individual states may find the resulting definitions insufficient. TPAEC encourages states to take advantage of every opportunity to provide state-specific contextual information, to clarify definitions, and to add information when those provided prove to inadequately reflect a state's procedures and requirements. The importance of providing information in a way that accurately captures the nuances and distinctiveness of each state's requirements and programs cannot be stressed too emphatically.

The state agency responsible for teacher education certification and licensure is the agency that will ultimately complete the state report on teacher preparation. The authority of these bodies vary among the states and may be separate from higher education institutions and agencies. Given the potential for definitions that do not accurately capture the unique features in a given state, TPAEC strongly recommends that states give responsibility for completing the report to personnel who are well-versed in the nuances of terminology and who are cognizant of the potential uses of the data that are being provided.

The state report is broad in scope and has the potential to significantly impact higher education institutions. Consequently, TPAEC strongly supports the involvement of a number of stakeholders from higher education, secondary and elementary education who are familiar with teacher preparation activities in the state in developing and completing the state document. Representatives from higher education and other related state agencies should review the report before its release.

States must develop an appeals process for challenges that will surely come, given the high visibility and high stakes associated with the Title II Report. States should think carefully about which agencies should be



involved in the appeals process and established those agreements at the outset of this project.

Finally, the involvement and collaboration of elementary, secondary and community college professionals on the report should extend well beyond the completion of the state report. It will likely stimulate joint discussions about the publication of information regarding the quality of teacher preparation programs in the state and how to generate public support for standards-based teacher preparation. One hopes, however, that it will also stimulate collaborative development of public policies that will improve the quality of teachers in the states.

CONTEXTUAL INFORMATION

Contextual information may provide critical additional data and narrative information that describes the unique aspects of a state's teacher preparation programs. Every opportunity should be taken to demonstrate the state's efforts to improve the quality of teacher preparation. This reporting procedure is confined to initial licensure of prospective teachers and is not concerned with additional licenses or a change in the status from initial to advanced licensure.

This section helps illustrate aspects of programs that are not necessarily explained by numerical calculations (e.g., student-to-faculty ratios in the supervision of student teachers that vary based on models such as traditional student teaching, internships, and professional development schools). Information in this section may be used to describe characteristics of the student population (e.g., changing demographics, socioeconomic status, English as a Second Language students) which may impact the data.

Additional information provided by institutions or by the State may be included, so the reader will have contextual information that might not otherwise be included in the report. However, additional information should be concise, descriptive, and limited to those elements that help the reader better understand your teacher preparation program.



The following comments parallel the sections of the draft state report and are intended to assist the states as they complete the document. For additional commentary on contextual information, see the heading on Supplemental Contextual Information Regarding Quality Improvement Efforts later in this manual.

TERMS THAT STATES MUST DEFINE OR USE

Note

Definitions also appear in Appendix B, Glossary, of *The Reference and Reporting Guide for Preparing State Reports on the Quality of Teacher Preparation*, April 19, 2000.

A number of terms have been defined by the U.S. Department of Education and guide the data collection and description of states' efforts to prepare teachers. Many of these definitions are noncontroversial and easily understood. A few definitions require additional commentary, and care should be taken in the application of these terms.

In addition, a number of terms are to be defined by the state, following careful review and consideration. A complete listing of definitions may be found in Appendix B of the *Reference and Reporting Guide*. States should pay particular attention to both the development and use of the following definitions when preparing their reports.

Academic Year

This term must be defined by the state. The official definition is any period of twelve consecutive months, as defined by the state.

To establish an "academic year," states may take into account regular institutional test reporting dates to the state, the annual American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (AACTE) institutional reports, or other already established reporting dates.

Alternative Route to Certification or Licensure

This term must be defined by the state. How states define this term is one of the most critical decisions that they can make in terms of this report. States must define and describe precisely what they mean when they use



this term in their reports. They must distinguish those programs that are held to alternative standards or alternative approval processes from those that offer alternative delivery systems or other innovative approaches.

It may be tempting to define the term “alternative” as meaning “alternative to higher education programs”. However, it may be more effective to define the “alternative” in a way that differentiates between those licensure programs that meet all state program requirements for students and those programs that meet a different set of standards. It is the considered opinion of TPAEC that teacher preparation programs that meet the same state standards as “regular” or “traditional” programs should not be equated to an alternative route to certification or licensure.

How states define alternative licensure affects those who are considered to be program completers. Please note that the sharply defined standards-based definition of “alternative route” differs from the common-language-use of the term “alternative route licensure program” used in most states.

At-Risk Institution

This term must be defined by the state. The term “at-risk institution” shall mean “at-risk of becoming low performing”. Thus, first see the definition for “Low-Performing Institution” below. How states identify and apply the criteria for defining “at-risk” and “low-performing institutions” will be very important decisions. If states define at-risk and low performing in ways that create large numbers of such institutions, extensive political repercussions could be created, especially in states already experiencing teacher shortages. If, on the other hand, few or no institutions are designated as low performing or at-risk, then the state may be perceived as having low standards.

Note

States are not required to publicly report “at-risk institutions”. However, these institutions should be informed that they need to make improvements, so they can work to avoid being designated as a “low-performing institution” in the future. Be aware that individuals who use Freedom of Information laws and “Sunshine” laws may generate requests for data on at-risk institutions, even if the states do not report these institutions.



Initial Certification

As specified in State Questionnaire 1a, as defined by the state.

Initial Certification Assessments

This term must be defined by the state. States are advised to contrast Initial Certification Assessments from second-level teacher licensure, licensure for administrators, and (in general) licensure as a librarian, counselor, etc. In other words, do not allow assessment data other than that for first-time teachers to be included in your report. States should not try to make any of this reporting add up to the total number of licenses issued by a state in a given year. This reporting requirement focuses on preparation, not on licensure. Some individuals who are eligible for, and obtain, a license in a given state may not be counted under this reporting mechanism.

Low-Performing Institutions

The definition of “Low-Performing Institutions” is to be defined by each state as described in Section 208:

- **State Assessment:** In order to receive funds under this Act, a State, not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of the Higher Education Amendments of 1998, shall have in place a procedure to identify, and assist, through the provision of technical assistance, low-performing programs of teacher preparation within institutions of higher education. Such State shall provide the Secretary an annual list of such low-performing institutions that includes an identification of those institutions at-risk of being placed on such list. Such levels of performance shall be determined solely by the State and may include criteria based upon information collected pursuant to this title. Such assessment shall be described in the report under section 207(b).

Test scores are not the only source of information that can be used when determining whether an institution is low performing or at-risk of becoming low performing. States are advised to apply multiple criteria and contextual information such as retention rates, institutional mission, and special programs for nontraditional or “at-risk” students.



However states define the term “low performing:”

- states must create an appeal process, and
- states must be prepared to provide technical assistance to all institutions placed on the list.

Note

Remember that the data will be broadly published by the state each year. Thus, the data become available for the review and comments of others.

Pass Rates

The percentage of program completers who pass all assessments (required for certification or licensure in the field of preparation) taken. Institutions are required to report pass rates for their program completers—in the most recent academic year—including pass rates by individual assessments, aggregate assessment categories, and summary statistics.

Each state will report pass rates by three methods:

- by institution within the state;
- for all regular teacher preparation programs statewide; and
- for each alternative route to certification approved by the state.

Regular (Traditional) Teacher Education Program

Any teacher preparation program that is not an alternative route to initial certification or licensure.

Teacher Preparation Program

A state-approved course of study, the completion of which signifies that an enrollee has met all the state’s educational requirements or training requirements or both for initial certification or licensure to teach in the state’s elementary or secondary schools. A teacher preparation program may be either a regular program or an alternative route to certification, as defined by the state. In addition, it may be within or outside an institution of higher education. For example, a regular or traditional program may be



one offered by an institution of higher education, or it may be one offered by a school district that meets all state expectations. An alternative route may be a ‘shortcut’ option offered by an institution of higher education to prepare emergency credential or substitute teachers, but that does not meet ‘regular’ state expectations. Also, an alternative route might be one offered by a for-profit provider that does not meet ‘regular’ state expectations.

In applying this definition, states and institutions may not determine that a teacher preparation program concludes after an individual has passed all examinations the state uses for initial certification or licensure, unless the state or institution requires that an individual pass these examinations before it will confer a degree, institutional certificate, program credential, transcript, or other proof of having met the program’s requirements.

In addition, for the purpose of reporting, The Reference and Reporting Guide considers all regular teacher preparation programs at a single institution of higher education to be a single program.

Test Closure Date

The meaning of the term “test closure date,” which must be defined by the state, is the date after which test results will not be included in pass rates for an academic year cohort.

How states define the term “test closure date” will depend in part on the states’ cycle of tests giving and when test results are received in your state. Test closure dates need to be established that will not disadvantage institutions with approved teacher preparation programs.

Note

Consider defining the term “academic year” for your institution when the term “test closure date” is defined.

Waiver

Any temporary or emergency permit, license, or other authorization that permits an individual to teach in a public school classroom in a state without having received an initial teaching certification or license from that state or any other state.



THE STATE QUESTIONNAIRE

This manual addresses seven sections of the State Questionnaire:

- **Section I**—Description of State Teacher Certification or Licensure Assessment and Other Requirements
- **Section II**—Description of State Teacher Standards, and the Alignment Between State Teacher Certification or Licensure Requirements and Assessments and State Student Standards and Assessments
- **Section III**—Pass Rates for Each of the Assessments Used by the State for Teacher Certification or Licensure
- **Section IV**—Information on Waivers of State Certification or Licensure Requirements
- **Section V**—Alternate Routes to Teacher Certification or Licensure, and Pass Rates for Teachers with Alternative Certification
- **Section VI**—Description of Proposed Criteria for Assessing the Performance of Teacher Preparation Programs Within Institutions in the State
- **Section VII**—State Efforts to Improve Teacher Quality

The *Reference and Reporting Guide* includes a Process Flowchart for completing the Annual State Reports. This flowchart summarizes the steps that states can take when preparing their reports. (see pp. 22 and 28 of the *Reference and Reporting Guide*.)

Section I

Description of State Teacher Certification or Licensure Assessment and Other Requirements (References below are to Appendix D of the *Reference and Reporting Guide* found on pp. 48-55)



- **Section I.a.**—If the *Reference and Reporting Guide* framework does not allow you to adequately describe your state requirements, descriptions or elements of what your state requires at all these levels should be added. States may want to attach footnotes of the specific, written assessments required. States should feel free to clarify the information located within the description areas on the State Questionnaire (see Appendix D of the *Reference and Reporting Guide* pp. 48-58). Terms used throughout the document, such as “provisional” or “probationary,” may have different meanings for different states. Consequently, states should clarify and precisely define their terminology.
- **Section I.b.**—The definition provided for Level II certificates may not apply to some states. If a state’s definition does not meet the 27-month employment designation, states should describe how a Level II certificate is defined.
- **Section I.c.**—Self-explanatory
- **Section I.d.**—Self-explanatory
- **Section I.e.**—Although the boxes in this section still reference only tests, states should add other examples of assessments they use beyond standardized tests. In addition, if individual institutions use different assessment tools that meet the state standards, these assessment tools should be identified.

In states where a standard or requirement exists but no specific assessment is required, states should use a Pass/Fail rating to avoid inappropriate interpretations. When assessments are used as Entry Tests, which are part of a state mandate for Gatekeeper Institutions, these assessments should be described. In addition, provide contextual information to indicate the number of applicants who were not admitted into the program due to their failure to pass entry tests. Examples of these entry tests—not exit tests—include ACT or SAT scores, Praxis I, GPA, or basic skills tests.



Section II

Description of State Teacher Standards, and the Alignment Between State Teacher Certification or Licensure Requirements and Assessments and State Student Standards and Assessments (see Appendix D, *Reference and Reporting Guide*, pp. 55-58)

- **Section II.a.**—Because not all states use the term “standards,” define words such as “criteria,” “competencies,” or “other benchmarks”. In addition, indicate if these concepts are linked to teacher licensure. Make distinctions between teacher standards and program standards. Indicate if these standards are linked to teacher licensure.
- **Section II.b.**—Self-explanatory

Section III

Pass Rates for Each of the Assessments Used by the State for Teacher Certification or Licensure (see Appendix D, *Reference and Reporting Guide*, pp. 55-58)

- **Section III.a.—Statewide Pass Rates:** This section provides guidance for completing the table entitled “State-Level Pass-Rate Data, By Institution”. This table is henceforth referred to as the “State- Level Table”. This section will outline the relevant elements and definitions needed to complete this table, provide calculation protocols and data sources, offer communication recommendations, and note some limitations and observations concerning the information in the State-Level Table.

Elements and Definitions

This discussion refers to the sample table found on pages 33-34 of The *Reference and Reporting Guide*.

Number of Program Completers: This number is the total of all teacher preparation program participants (i.e., admitted students) who are documented as having finished all the requirements of a state-approved teacher preparation program during the academic year being reported.



Assessment Code Number: These numbers are provided by the state agency or commercial testing agency, in general, either ETS or NES.

Note

Both ETS and NES have tables showing which assessments fall into which category—Basic Skills, Professional Knowledge, or Subject/Content Knowledge—for each state. Since this method varies from state to state, refer to these tables to determine which category to use for each test in your particular state. (These tables can be found in Appendix E of the *Reference and Reporting Guide*.)

Cut Score: The passing score on an assessment as defined by the state.

Number Taking the Assessment: The number of program completers who took each code-numbered assessment. In ‘gatekeeper’ or ‘exit’ institutions, more students will have taken some of the assessments than the number of students who completed the program. Report only the number of students who completed the program and took the tests.

Note

These figures are reported to the institution by the state agency or testing agency. It is important for institutions to cross-check these figures to determine if each reported test-taker is indeed one of that institution’s program graduates. It is also important to verify that the particular subject/content area test taken is in an area that the student completed. If the number of students taking any assessment is less than 10, do not report pass scores for that assessment.

Single Assessment Pass Rate: The pass rate computed from the following numerator and denominator. (Compute to four decimal places.)

A/B where

A = the number of graduates (as extracted from the denominator) who passed the assessment, according to the state’s criterion for passing each assessment at the time the assessment was taken; and

B = the number of individuals in a cohort of program graduates who took a given assessment used for initial teacher certification or licensure by the state



Aggregate Rates: The proportion of individuals who completed the program and who passed all the tests they took in each of the following skill or knowledge areas, among all program completers who took one or more tests in each area: Basic Skills, Professional Knowledge, Academic Content Areas, Other Content Areas, Teaching Special Populations, and Performance Assessments.

- The “# taking assessment” in those lines is the number of program completers who took one or more of the single assessments listed under the general category.
- The “# passing” is the number that passed all the assessments they attempted in this general category.

Note

The definition does not say all that is required. Obviously, no one program completer is required to take all the assessments listed under this category. However, many will take multiple assessments. The data for this summary should come from summing the Institutional-Level, Pass Rate Data. It is most important that the states make certain that all institutions use the same classification of the assessments into the six categories.

Summary Pass Rate: The proportion of program completers who passed all the tests they took in their areas of specialization among those who took one or more tests in their specialization areas. Summary pass rates are based on all assessments that an individual needs to pass in order to become initially certified or licensed as a teacher in a given area of specialization in a state.

Each program completer is classified as a “pass” or a “fail”. If a program completer passes all the assessments they attempted and the assessments they attempted were required of them for their licensure, then they are considered a “pass.”

Notes

If a program completer takes an assessment that is not required in the student’s area of preparation for initial licensure and fails that test, then that failure does not make him/her a “fail”. For example, if a mathematics major takes a physics test and fails it, then that failure in itself will not make that student a “fail” and it need not be reported.



The number of “Program Completers” listed at the top of the form (see Reference and Reporting Guide Appendix D, Table D2, State-Level Aggregate and Summary Assessment Pass Rate Data for Regular Teacher Preparation Programs, p. 62) may exceed the number listed in the “Summary Pass Rate”. Reason: Some program completers may not take any tests, for example, those students going out-of-state to work.

For State-Level Pass Rate Data, the summary pass rate is the sum of all institutional “passes” divided by the sum of all the institutional program completers who took at least one test. It is not the average of the institutional summary pass rates.

Table 2, page 13, of *The Reference and Reporting Guide* provides more information on summary data.

Section III.b.—Accredited or Approved, and Low-Performing State Teacher Preparation Programs

States must define the way in which institutions are determined to be low performing or at-risk of being designated as low performing. It is the considered opinion of TPAEC that states should develop absolute criteria for this determination. By absolute criteria, TPAEC means fixed standards of performance or outcomes. Taking this approach is preferable to choosing the implementation of a relative standard that would always result in some institutions being placed in the low performing category (e.g. the bottom 10 percent of institutions or institutions in the -3 standard deviation, etc.) The adoption of absolute standards will, of course, make it possible that no institution will be designated as low-performing or at-risk in a particular year, but we think this is a fairer approach. It also would not preclude a state from redefining its standards for low performing designation in the future.

States should notify individual institutions of any low-performing designations prior to publication of such data. States should also create plans to assist low performing institutions through the provision of technical assistance as early as possible to support institutional efforts to improve. States should consider multiple measures of program quality when defining the terms “low-performing” and “at-risk”. These measures might include the satisfaction rates of employers, the employability rates of program completers, the satisfaction rates of program completers both



upon program completion and two or three years after program completion, professional retention rates in teaching, faculty tenure rates for completers, and graduate school admission or completion or both.

Section IV

Information on Waivers of State Certification or Licensure Requirements

Note

States must fill out a separate waiver table (see Appendix D Section VI in the Reference and Reporting Guide) for each category of the waivers as identified in the Reference and Reporting Guide (see definitions on pp. 15-17).

Section V

Alternate Routes to Teacher Certification or Licensure, and Pass Rates for Teachers with Alternative Certification

Section V.a.—States need to define their use of the term “alternative route to certification”. It is the recommendation of TPAEC that states should provide complete descriptions of alternative certification programs so as to distinguish alternative delivery systems from alternative standards routes.

Section V.b.—Self-explanatory

Section VI

Description of Proposed Criteria for Assessing the Performance of Teacher Preparation Programs Within Institutions in the State

States may provide additional narrative text to describe other programs and candidate assessment or accreditation criteria (e.g., TEAC or NCATE).

Section VII

State Efforts to Improve Teacher Quality

The Secretary of Education is specifically required to gather and report data on the states’ efforts to improve teacher quality. Thus, the states may go beyond the examples listed in this document to broadly and fully



describe all statewide actions that are focused on improving the quality of both teachers and teacher preparation programs. Examples of other efforts may include initiatives of recruitment; preparation (content, pedagogy, and clinical experiences); induction and mentoring; professional development; and funding.

States may submit information on change processes that were already underway prior to the reporting year. In doing so, background is provided for the descriptions of their current progress. States should discuss new alternative routes and alternative delivery models in the context of improving the quality of teacher preparation, not only as a means to deal with teacher shortages.

LINKING INFORMATION TO THE SECRETARY OF EDUCATION'S REPORT TO CONGRESS

States and institutions alike should keep in mind that the Secretary of Education is statutorily required to include a comparison of states' efforts to improve teaching quality. This requirement is noteworthy because TPAEC deliberations have underlined the importance of trying to describe, explain, and report on efforts to improve teacher preparation programs in more than a purely quantitative fashion. TPAEC acknowledges the importance of quantitative reports and values such data. At the same time, TPAEC recognizes the manifest limitation of quantitative data and their ability to be misused, misunderstood, and abused by subsequent interpreters.

Since the U.S. Department of Education has stated that it "will not use the pass-rate data collected in these annual reports for the purpose of making comparisons among the states, and it will strongly advise the public not to do so," it is a fair question to ask what states' efforts the Secretary of Education will compare. One possibility is the initial licensure standards that the states have established or recently modified. An element might include a review of which tests have been adopted for use and the cut scores for those tests. Not much other data is contained in the annual



reports that the Secretary can use to compare the states' efforts to improve the quality of teacher preparation programs.

The section on supplemental information in both state and institutional annual reports offers an opportunity to address the information available to the Secretary of Education for the comparisons that must be made.

Clearly states have the determinative role in defining what is and what is not considered high quality in teacher preparation programs. Accordingly, the text that immediately follows may provide guidance to the states on how to approach this problem. Each state must make choices that reflect its own definition of what constitutes quality improvement efforts in teacher preparation.

TPAEC has concerns regarding the approach, methods, or consequences of the legislation that requires these annual reports. However, it is clear that Congress initiated these report-card requirements out of a deep and abiding concern about students' performance in school. This issue should guide states when they are selecting supplemental information to include in their annual reports. The types of questions that states should ask follow.

- How are teacher graduates performing once they are in the field?
- Are school employers satisfied with teacher graduates?
- Are teacher graduates improving their students' scores on tests?
- Has the state supported or encouraged teacher preparation program initiatives that improve the answers to the above questions?

One possible way to answer such questions is to identify the "best practices" that have become part of teacher preparation programs and that improve those programs.

A note of caution is warranted here. Thoughtful people disagree on how to measure evidence of "best practice." States should foster a culture of evidence to support assertions that best practices have meaningful and



identifiable links to improved elementary and secondary student performance or improved performance by teacher graduates. In this regard, states might consider the kind of evidentiary rigor suggested by award criteria for teacher preparation program excellence as published in the *Federal Register* (Volume 65, Number 14, January 21, 2000; see especially page 3430). The approach described in that publication should be of some help in selecting which “best practices” to report. In those states where no Best Practices/Standards for judging the quality of teacher preparation programs have been developed, both institutions and state officials may want to look to national guidelines.

DEFINITIONS

Definitions appear in Appendix B, Glossary, of *The Reference and Reporting Guide for Preparing State Reports on the Quality of Teacher Preparation*.



APPENDIX

STATUTORY PROVISIONS

Title II, Sections 207 and 208 of the Higher Education Act

SEC. 207. Accountability for Programs That Prepare Teachers

- (a) **Development of Definitions and Reporting Methods**—Within nine months of the date of enactment of the Higher Education Amendments of 1998, the Commissioner of the National Center for Education Statistics, in consultation with States and institutions of higher education, shall develop key definitions for terms, and uniform reporting methods (including the key definitions for the consistent reporting of pass rates), related to the performance of elementary school and secondary school teacher preparation programs.
- (b) **State Report Card on the Quality of Teacher Preparations**—Each State that receives funds under this Act shall provide to the Secretary, within two years of the date of enactment of the Higher Education Amendments of 1998, and annually thereafter, in a uniform and comprehensible manner that conforms with the definitions and methods established in subsection (a), a State report card on the quality of teacher preparation in the State, which shall include at least the following:
- (1) A description of the teacher certification and licensure assessments, and any other certification and licensure requirements, used by the State.
 - (2) The standards and criteria that prospective teachers must meet in order to attain initial teacher certification or licensure and to be certified or licensed to teach particular subjects or in particular grades within the State.
 - (3) A description of the extent to which the assessments and requirements described in paragraph (1) are aligned with the State's standards and assessments for students.



- (4) The percentage of teaching candidates who passed each of the assessments used by the State for teacher certification and licensure, and the passing score on each assessment that determines whether a candidate has passed that assessment.
- (5) The percentage of teaching candidates who passed each of the assessments used by the State for teacher certification and licensure, disaggregated and ranked, by the teacher preparation program in that State from which the teacher candidate received the candidate's most recent degree, which shall be made available widely and publicly.
- (6) Information on the extent to which teachers in the State are given waivers of State certification or licensure requirements, including the proportion of such teachers distributed across high- and low-poverty school districts and across subject areas.
- (7) A description of each State's alternative routes to teacher certification, if any, and the percentage of teachers certified through alternative certification routes who pass State teacher certification or licensure assessments.
- (8) For each State, a description of proposed criteria for assessing the performance of teacher preparation programs within institutions of higher education in the State, including indicators of teacher candidate knowledge and skills.
- (9) Information on the extent to which teachers or prospective teachers in each State are required to take examinations or other assessments of their subject matter knowledge in the area or areas in which the teachers provide instruction, the standards established for passing any such assessments, and the extent to which teachers or prospective teachers are required to receive a passing score on such assessments in order to teach in specific subject areas or grade levels.



(c) Initial Report

- (1) **In General**—Each State that receives funds under this Act, not later than six months of the date of enactment of the Higher Education Amendments of 1998 and in a uniform and comprehensible manner, shall submit to the Secretary the information described in paragraphs (1), (5), and (6) of subsection (b). Such information shall be compiled by the Secretary and submitted to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives not later than nine months after the date of enactment of the Higher Education Amendments of 1998.
- (2) **Construction**—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to require a State to gather information that is not in the possession of the State or the teacher preparation programs in the State, or readily available to the State or teacher preparation programs.

(d) Report of the Secretary on the Quality of Teacher Preparation

- (1) **Report Card**—The Secretary shall provide to Congress, and publish and make widely available, a report card on teacher qualifications and preparation in the United States, including all the information reported in paragraphs (1) through (9) of subsection (b). Such report shall identify States for which eligible States and eligible partnerships received a grant under this title. Such report shall be so provided, published and made available not later than two years six months after the date of enactment of the Higher Education Amendments of 1998 and annually thereafter.
- (2) **Report to Congress**—The Secretary shall report to Congress:
 - (a) a comparison of States' efforts to improve teaching quality;
and



- (b) regarding the national mean and median scores on any standardized test that is used in more than one State for teacher certification or licensure.
- (3) **Special Rules**—In the case of teacher preparation programs with fewer than 10 graduates taking any single initial teacher certification or licensure assessment during an academic year, the Secretary shall collect and publish information with respect to an average pass rate on State certification or licensure assessments taken over a three-year period.
- (e) **Coordination**—The Secretary, to the extent practicable, shall coordinate the information collected and published under this title among States for individuals who took State teacher certification or licensure assessments in a State other than the State in which the individual received the individual's most recent degree.
- (f) **Institutional Report Cards on the Quality of Teacher Preparation**
 - (1) **Report Card**—Each institution of higher education that conducts a teacher preparation program that enrolls students receiving Federal assistance under this Act, not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of the Higher Education Amendments of 1998 and annually thereafter, shall report to the State and the general public, in a uniform and comprehensible manner that conforms with the definitions and methods established under subsection (a), the following information:
 - (a) **Pass Rate**
 - (i) For the most recent year for which the information is available, the pass rate of the institution's graduates on the teacher certification or licensure assessments of the State in which the institution is located, but only for those students who took those assessments within three years of completing the program.



- (ii) A comparison of the program's pass rate with the average pass rate for programs in the State.
 - (iii) In the case of teacher preparation programs with fewer than 10 graduates taking any single initial teacher certification or licensure assessment during an academic year, the institution shall collect and publish information with respect to an average pass rate on State certification or licensure assessments taken over a three-year period.
- (b) **Program Information**—The number of students in the program, the average number of hours of supervised practice teaching required for those in the program, and the faculty-student ratio in supervised practice teaching.
- (c) **Statement**—In States that approve or accredit teacher education programs, a statement of whether the institution's program is so approved or accredited.
- (d) **Designation as Low-Performing**—Whether the program has been designated as low-performing by the State under section 208(a).
- (2) **Requirement**—The information described in paragraph (1) shall be reported through publications such as school catalogs and promotional materials sent to potential applicants, secondary school guidance counselors, and prospective employers of the institution's program graduates.
- (3) **Fines**—In addition to the actions authorized in section 487(c), the Secretary may impose a fine not to exceed \$25,000 on an institution of higher education for failure to provide the information described in this subsection in a timely or accurate manner.

Sec. 208 State Functions

- (a) **State Assessment**—In order to receive funds under this Act, a State, not later than two years after the date of enactment of the



Higher Education Amendments of 1998, shall have in place a procedure to identify, and assist, through the provision of technical assistance, low-performing programs of teacher preparation within institutions of higher education. Such State shall provide the Secretary an annual list of such low-performing institutions that includes an identification of those institutions at-risk of being placed on such list. Such levels of performance shall be determined solely by the State and may include criteria based upon information collected pursuant to this title. Such assessment shall be described in the report under section 207(b).

- (b) **Termination of Eligibility**—Any institution of higher education that offers a program of teacher preparation in which the State has withdrawn the State’s approval or terminated the State’s financial support due to the low performance of the institution’s teacher preparation program based upon the State assessment described in subsection (a):
 - (1) shall be ineligible for any funding for professional development activities awarded by the Department of Education; and
 - (2) shall not be permitted to accept or enroll any student that receives aid under title IV of this Act in the institution’s teacher preparation program.
- (c) **Negotiated Rulemaking**—If the Secretary develops any regulations implementing subsection (b)(2), the Secretary shall submit such proposed regulations to a negotiated rulemaking process, which shall include representatives of States, institutions of higher education, and educational and student organizations.



**American Association of State
Colleges and Universities**

**1307 New York Avenue, N.W. • Fifth Floor
Washington, DC 20005-4701**

202.293.7070 • 202.296.5819 • www.aascu.org